

Igor Shumeiko
Romanovs. Mistakes of a great dynasty

Chapter 1. Apocalyptic idyll

During the years of strict revision of the tsarist heritage, the Bolsheviks meticulously, among other things, listened to the Golden Fund of Russian music - great symphonies, operas. The plot "Tchaikovsky, Borodin, Mussorgsky in the face of the Revolutionary Tribunal" has a tragicomic meaning, and the music commissars did not let it go to waste. What scope for satirists, comedians - "the struggle for a new musical repertoire"! Glinka's opera "A Life for the Tsar", staged in 1924 as "For the Hammer and Sickle", evoked applause from the Odessa and Baku public, new heroes came out to bow: the Red Army soldier Grebenyuk, the Red partisans who led into the dense forest (this one was preserved) ... detachment of interventionists and White Guards.

Glavlit's secret circular dated May 14, 1925, signed by Pavel Ivanovich Lebedev-Polyansky, who headed this organization in 1922-1931, left about 40 operas from the Russian and world heritage, but with the condition of indispensable alteration of plots. The circular is unfadingly colorful:

"... The operas The Snow Maiden, Aida, The Demon are ideologically unacceptable: the democratic-monarchist tendency in The Snow Maiden, the imperialist odor of Aida, the mystical biblical content of The Demon...

"Khovanshchina" - the interpretation in the production of the opera should be such that the viewer's sympathy is not on the side of the old, outgoing "Khovanshchina", but of the new young life represented by Golitsyn, the Preobrazhensky people and young Peter ... "

Progressives! Peter and Khovansky - what! Even in the War of the Scarlet and White Roses, Antiochus and Ptolemy knew exactly who was more progressive at that time (a feature of the then perception of history).

""The Queen of Spades" is to cross out the final phenomenon of the scene at the ball: from the words "Her Majesty is now pleased to welcome" to the end of the picture.

"The Tsar's Bride" by Rimsky-Korsakov - to eliminate excesses in terms of glorifying the Tsar.

"Mermaid" Dargomyzhsky - cross out the final apotheosis.

"Eugene Onegin" - omit the fake one from the first picture

episode of a feudal idyll ... "

No, not without reason, and during the years of strict censorship, this plot broke through to us, our almost "archetype": the commissar, the leader looks through the "feature numbers" and distributes instructions to fellow artists. Byvalov - "Volga-Volga" ,, Ogurtsov - "Carnival Night", even Dynin - "Welcome, or no entry is allowed to outsiders" ... You can not show leadership at the level of Zhdanov ... but Byvalov is just right. They, the commissars, themselves liked to manage "art-culture-propaganda" more than, for example, agriculture, where they "threw" the wrongdoers. Yes, and the public was somehow ... more interesting to observe the process of managing the muses, charites by the comparators than herds, crops.

But in that circular of Glavlit, almost a ready-made humoresque, I was extremely struck, brought to the most difficult thoughts by one point ... In the language of opera programs, "suddenly the Theme of Mockery leaves, is replaced by the Theme of an Unexpected Resolution, the heavy Steps of Fate."

My thought was riveted by that brief revolutionary trial of "Eugene Onegin": "A false serf-owning idyll in the first picture..."

Indeed, it is an idyll. The golden age, "our everything." Who are we without Pushkin? I recalled an old evening at the opera with a friend at the Bolshoi Theater. A program is unfolded on her knees: "In the Larins' garden, girls pick berries with songs ..." Tatyana and Olga Larins, nanny Filipyevna, deduce the famous: "The habit is given to us from above, it is a substitute for happiness."

An idyll in Tchaikovsky's "source": Pushkin's "Eugene Onegin" - the golden balance of mild irony, boundless admiration, sharp insight and ... tenderness:

In the maid's garden, on the ridges,

Gathered berries in the bushes

And they sang in chorus

(A command based on

So that the master's berry secretly

Evil lips do not eat,

And they were busy singing:

Rural witticism!).

Yes, this is ours, the entire Golden Age measured to us by Russian history ... And suddenly, in the middle of the pastoral choir, a certain bearded man,

tough, prickly reader:

"Bible. The book of Deuteronomy, chapter 23, verse 24

Chapter 24, verse 21

And with a slight jump - the most scraping, cruel and mournful: "Chapter 25, verse 4.
Do not block the mouth of the ox when he threshes."

What happens? Was our Orthodox landowner greedier, more mercantile and harsher towards his peasants than the "ancient Jewish" one towards strangers and oxen? And he counted his berries more carefully and sparingly than even a contemporary Jew somewhere in the "Pale of Settlement", who fulfilled the requirements of our Russian Bible as his Jewish Torah, observed all those 613 prohibitions and did not block his mouth?

This peasant-lordly berry collision, however, was well known in Russia in addition to Pushkin, who gave an example of a poetic miracle, divine harmony, a look that turns into a masterpiece, into gold (truly the Golden Age!) Everything around, including almost disgusting phenomena. Which remained so after the removal of poetic anesthesia. And it is the mediocrity, the routine, the "normality" of that order that is especially jarring. This is not the five hundredth denunciation of "serfdom" on the example of the vile maniac Saltychikha - a stupid trick of nihilists, revolutionary commoners, statistically exposed, ridiculed even by the famous critic of Russia, the main American Sovietologist Richard Pipes. In the book "Russia under the Old Regime" he essentially methodically defended Russia from Radishchev and our subsequent accusers of "slavery". Pipes, I remember, said that judging a Russian village by Saltychikha is the same as judging Victorian London by Jack the Ripper.

That "critical" trend is well illustrated even today by the very structure of historical information provided. For example, a modern text program allows you to almost facsimile a hive of Wikipedia articles:

Serfdom. From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia:

"...4 Serfdom in Eastern Europe

4.1 Chronology of the enslavement of peasants in Russia

See also:

Saltychikha

Bonded servility

Landlord peasants

State peasants

Ascribed peasants

Yard people (serfs)

Right of the first night

Residence permit»

The first in the article "Serfdom... See also:" is Saltychikha. Of course, no one will blame ... the owner of Wikipedia, who periodically looks at us so penetratingly and sadly from laptop screens, hinting at the need to send donations for the maintenance of The Free Encyclopedia. No, just Wiki is an excellent mirror of prevailing trends and stereotypes. It is not necessary (to solve this particular question) to review hundreds of books. Take a look at the Wiki and the sum of many dozens of them, the mainstream is immediately visible ...

But above was an example of how the biblical commandments were violated - normal, average, good landowners, appointed by the Orthodox tsar to be stewards of the peasants - "Christians", if you really read the origin of the term meticulously. Pushkin has a real Idyll, and ... this stone, flying over the berry garden of the landowners Larins, flies much further, right into the sacred garden of our archetypes, where they stand as if carved in stone: "Russian nobleman" (ptirota, wealth of nature, condescending good nature) , a meek, gentle peasant, and ... including a "Jew" (a huckster, a bore, a miser) ... After all, extreme Judophiles, like one of the heroes of this book, Vladimir Solovyov, listing the virtues of a Jew (tenacity, vitality, adaptability, sober prudence ...), did not try to include generosity and breadth of nature in this list, rightfully leaving it to us.

This means that the very "serfdom" not only hindered the socio-economic, industrial progress of Russia, which liberal and revolutionary teachers have been telling us for a whole century, while half the country sighed to itself: "Yes, to hell with them all!" (meaning both Progress and the teachers themselves).

This means that the point is not only in some kind of stupid, possibly invented Progress, but in an imperceptible, but fatal two-century distortion of the very spiritual underlying foundation, the very Russianness of the Russian nobility. As a further consequence of this distortion: a former Russian serf in an embrace with his brother commissar ... Levinson (let's take Fadeevsky at random, but it is clear that his name is legion) they cut and shot the Larins, Obolenskys and Saltykovs, not at all disturbed by their own, peasant share, Russianness.

I admit that such a biblical-opera-historical comparison will seem somewhat unexpected. Maybe even playing along, throwing up an argument for the revolutionaries and that same Commissioner for Musical Affairs? Although for him, probably, the Bible would have been just as dubious White Guardism as Pushkin's "false serf idyll."

But still. Hundred times reconciled with serfdom, with all the strength of the soul you argue with the false. You do not want to admit that the "stupid commissar", albeit inadvertently, involuntarily, but guessed it. Even knowing by heart everything

the content of the next act of the opera "Russian History", which begins as if with a theatrical remark: "A hundred years have passed ...". 'That is, even in front of all the bloody details of the Revolution, the Civil War, anyway, a certain part of the mental system remains inaccessible to the laws of the "socio-political system." The golden age of Pushkin, our Idyll on the verge (as it turned out later) of Death... managed, however, to form the mentality of the nation.

And confirmation can be found without even going beyond this random musical plot of 1925. Yes, yes, after all, the omnipotent commissar, shredding in any way, even in the wildest way defenseless operas, could NOT cancel them. Having received the "go-ahead" of some Lunacharsky, he would easily have promoted Onegin to the Decembrists, Petrashevists, Narodnaya Volya, finally, to the Bolsheviks ... but he could simply delete, deprive the nation of Pushkin's Roman, Opera - IT could. That's why he messed around, rules. After all, I felt (most likely unconsciously): there must be something in this place, something standing, but with our correct sign, the stamp of "historical materialism" ... And what kind of place is this - by whom, what is it outlined by?

Examples like the one above were pushed aside by some patriots, because Russophobic opponents tried to use them completely incorrectly, to perform a real trick by extending these "slave examples" throughout the history of Russia. But in reality, those excesses of serfdom are directly connected (and exactly coincide chronologically!) with one special period in the history of Russia, with its accelerated modernization. Considering a little wider - with the period of the Romanovs.

Those who write about Russian history somehow did not focus on this paradox: it was during the period when Russia was collecting sincere (and not very) greetings from Europe, as the most rapidly civilized country, that, in fact, real serfdom, "radishchev slavery" appeared. ending up as an Accelerated Fee

Modernization, Civilization, "approaching Europe."

Officially, the peasants were enslaved by the Council Code of 1649 of Alexei Mikhailovich, whose reign is considered the beginning of Russian modernization. Critics of Peter, Slavophiles, supporters of the "people's monarchy" like Ivan Solonevich even argue that the real, correct modernization was under Alexei Mikhailovich, and not in the shyness of his son.

And the "berry" example, which opened my research, refers to the period of 1762-1861, let's call it "developed serfdom." According to the conditional scale of approaching Europe, that was the next stage: now not only Russia has become a full-fledged European country, but Russian nobles are recognized as civilized Europeans. For the first time, Russians - private individuals, not diplomats, government officials freely travel around Europe, live, buy real estate there,

marry foreigners. And it was at this time that the liberation of the nobles from compulsory service, their enlightenment gave impetus to the process, as a result of which serfdom in some cases was likened to slavery. This is very cautious, refuting the radical "denouncers of slavery", and recognizes Richard Pipes, whose book "Russia under the old regime" will be discussed later.

The highest rise of enlightenment, humanism - at the cost of pre-Christian, and, as it turned out above, even - to biblical slavery (for those berries they retreated right up to the ancient Babylonian Hammurabi or even further).

In the final chapters, the history of the reign of the last Romanov will be considered from several, perhaps unexpected, points of view. Initially, I thought of naming the book about Nikolai P "Antitsar", but after some deliberation, reviewing all the circumstances involved, I decided to leave this title for only one chapter.

"Anti..." is not a stylization of the medieval Antipopes (Antipope Benedict XIII, etc.) or of Engels' well-known pamphlet "Anti-dühring" (the meaning of which was - against Dühring). "Antitsar" is not a slogan "against Tsar Nicholas II", but rather a reminder of some of the properties of the tsar that made him a kind of ... antiparticle of the monarchy. Antiparticles, as is known, together with their opposites, ordinary particles, give instantaneous annihilation. The picture of February 1917, which shocked all contemporaries, the instantaneous disappearance of a thousand-year-old monarchy and a three-hundred-year-old dynasty just resembles annihilation.

But "the retinue plays the king", and much more than about the personal properties of Nicholas II will be told about his entourage, associates and opponents, historical conditions.

And... about predecessors...

Chapter 2. Three Paradoxes of the Romanov Dynasty

It is amazing how completely and carefully they decomposed into opposite shelves the two most important reigns in the history of Russia: the "Reforms" of Alexander II the Liberator and the "Counter-reforms" of Alexander III the Peacemaker. This is periodically broken through by the nonsense of the historical plot, and - a characteristic sign - countless "but suddenly" appearing in the narratives ... Freemasons, Decembrists, Narodnaya Volya, Bolsheviks ...

It is important to show the internal coherence of the entire period 1856-1894, during the reign of Alexandrov P. Sh. still a drawing

an idea or even just a suspicion that the previous classifications were wrong. The protrusion and naive attention to unimportant details, the opposition Father (Reforms) - Son (Counter reforms) obscured several important details of the history of Russia. It led to the oblivion of the main meaning of the two reigns, which provides the basis for their unification in the period of "Two Alexandria" (1856-1894) or, if you like, "The Healing of Russia".

It was the misunderstanding of the essence of the work of father and son that most of all let down his grandson, Nikolai P. True, the first third of his, Nikolai, reign, the team of Alexander III, headed by his best minister Sergei Witte, was still working, and it can be considered a continuation of Two Alexandria until about 1902-1903 years. The launch of the Trans-Siberian Railway is perhaps their last great accomplishment. Further - already the Nikolaev nominee Bezobrazov, war, revolution, another war, another revolution. This is where this introductory word "suddenly" reigns: "Japan in 1905 was close to complete depletion of resources, but suddenly a revolution ... In 1916, Russia established military production, supplying the army and was close to victory ... but suddenly Guchkov and Rodzianko, having agreed in February with the chief of staff Alekseev ... "

In the case of Alexander II the Liberator, there is generally a strange symmetry: the writers who mold his father, Nicholas I, into a majestic column, mercilessly scold their son for all the reforms, indulgences to liberals and democrats. And in addition, they play on the opposition of Alexander P not only to his father, but also to his son - Alexander Sh. They especially press on the list of his father's appointees - Loris-Melikov, Milyutin ... really quickly expelled by his son, and on a selection of facts that supposedly fit into a strict scheme " Reforms - Counter-reforms. The most flashy, absurd examples of this opposition I will give later.

This is an example of doctrinairism, moreover mutual, liberal and pseudo-patriotic. "Liberals": ours - Alexander P and Reforms. "Patriots": ours - Alexander Shi Counter-reforms. Whose in this case

all of Russia with its history is incomprehensible. And most importantly, it is forgotten that with all the external difference in their reigns, father and son did one Great Deed.

In any images, similitudes, I am ready to explain this. For example, History is often compared to the Road, the movement along the "historical path". Fine. Then imagine the Great historical obstacle, the huge Historical Pit, which Tsars Alexander II and III had to go around. But ... to go around, you must first turn the steering wheel to the left (reforms, "Tsar Liberator"), and then, to stay on the Road - to the right (counter-reforms, "Tsar-Peacemaker"). They don't drive in a different way, so that only left-left or right-right, there are no such roads, paths in nature. Except... yes, yes, that's right - "ring", on which the historical path is running in a circle.

Or else they liken the State to the Body, the Organism... Okay. There was a huge, deadly tumor in the body of the country, one was cut and removed (Alexander P), the other was sewn up (Alexander Sh).

And the change of ministers Loris-Melikov, Milyutin, Ignatiev, Vannovsky is nothing more than putting down the scalpel and taking a surgical needle. Here, the example of the permanent Minister of War Alexander II, General Dmitry Alekseevich Milyutin, the creator of the first post-serfdom, post-recruit army, is indicative. Yes, in 1881 he was replaced by Vannovsky, but in memory of his merits, in 1898, having retired for many years, he was promoted (a unique case!) to field marshal general, eventually becoming the last field marshal of Russia.

It is to draw attention to the unity of action of these emperors that I introduce the term "Two Alexandria" - 1856-1894, removing layers of primitive comparisons that group, for example, Alexander PSh ("right") with Nicholas I (certainly "super right">) - against, of course, Alexander P (liberal). I will also try to show the almost comical consequences of such false groupings, when, in captivity of tendencies, they miss even with external portraiture.

But all these images, comparisons will be powerless without recognizing the entire magnitude of the problem ("Pits", or "Tumours"), the abnormality, unnaturalness of state life for 99 years, from 1762 to 1861. And with this, with recognition, there have always been great difficulties.

Our propaganda in some deceitful, false periods has often been torn between the desire to point out Great Steps, Overcomings, Solutions to Great Problems and ... the fear of admitting that these Problems were, that they could even be in a pomaded, ironed as a parade of History. For example, the Suslov-Gorbachev newspaper workshops tried to mask such a contradiction with formulas like: "Even more complete, even more all-round satisfaction ...". Remembering from Marx that conflicts are the engines of history, they tried to draw a conflict between the Ideal and something ... super-super-ideal.

And it's even easier to disguise the serious illness of that period, 1762-1861: The victory over Napoleon, the Golden Age of culture, undoubted achievements ...

But the main disease (and theologians, by the way, always link them), which had to be treated during the "Two Alexandria" period, is by no means a retreat, a departure from some Western or "global" principles of development, no, the period of 1762-1861 is national self-betrayal, distortion of Russianness.

What kind of illness was that, an obstacle on the Russian historical path? The answer "serfdom" is not entirely complete. Until 1762, before the "Manifesto on the Liberty of the Nobility", the Russian state was kept on the balance of "service and draft classes" on a simple

semantic bundle: the peasants belong to the nobles, the nobles belong to the sovereign. Just a magnificent line from the manifesto of Peter [1717 on the occasion of the birth of his son: "God blessed me with another recruit!" (this is about the second son, from Catherine, alas, who did not live long).

The service of the "serviceman", pardon the tautology, the estate basically consisted in military service, as the French say - "blood tax". What is harder - "plowing" or war? Indirect answer: in the Sudebniks of 1497 and 1550, several articles are devoted to preventing servicemen (landlords) from becoming slaves in order to avoid public service.

For brevity, I will quote Richard Pipes (I had to argue a lot with his work "Russia under the Old Regime" in my previous book) - in this case, Pipes is good as an adder of 5-6 leading Russian historians: "The peasants felt the connection of their serfdom with compulsory service nobles." Ekaterina broke this connection. She issued the "Manifesto on the Liberty of the Nobles" of 1762 together with Peter the Third, but the entire new statute of the nobleman was created over the next fifteen years, this is another dozen acts up to 92 articles of the "Charter of Letters

1785, signed by her personally. The enslavement of Ukrainian peasants also coincided with the "liberty of the nobility". The power of the nobles and the possibility of mobilizing (squeezing out of the village) additional funds grew significantly. It is this period that can be considered classical, "developed by serfdom." A third of our Histories interpret this as a mistake, a third as an intensification of the exploitation of the peasantry by the ruling class. Another third simply turn a blind eye to this - it is precisely for the continuation of the historical narrative that they need the most turns "suddenly", "but then ...", "BUT THESE ...".

I would call the period 1762-1861 "The Big Loan". The peasantry, of course. Under this "All-Russian loan" Catherine was:

- 5 wars won - 2 Turkish, 1 Swedish, 2 Polish (Bar

confederation, Kosciuszko uprising),

- one of the most important "natural borders" was reached: the Black Sea, - all 3 branches of the Russian people were reunited.

A whole library of "critics" of Catherine the Great has already accumulated, starting with the "analytical note" of her son Pavel to Herzen ("it's simply indecent to read the story of Catherine") and the intellectual's many years of sneer at the "forgotten newspapers of the times of the Ochakovskys and the conquest of the Crimea." But just remember the results of her reign, her wars: Russian peasants, townspeople settled where for 900 years they had been only as captive slaves! The shores of the Black Sea, southern, "New" Russia have been mastered. And compare this with the campaigns of the armies of her unfortunate son and both grandchildren: borrowing

150,000 "tin" soldiers in Russian uniforms for European monarchs, to play, to solve their problems ...

In addition, the nobility, which was then, if we continue the financial analogies, the "manager of credit", laid the foundation for a new Russian culture. There was such a short formula, Herzen in particular, often repeated: "Russian culture, literature, the Golden Age - these are two generations of unworn noble backs" ... And besides, the nobility manages to serve, already "out of honor" (the quality of an officer, diplomatic, bureaucratic corps is generally growing), and it is more successful to mobilize (exploit) the peasantry.

Equally, by the way, the "collectivization" 160 years later is also a Big All-Russian loan. The source is the same: Russian village.

It is much less often remembered that in those periods there was another estate, if not "robbed", then in any case, an estate whose gigantic savings were expropriated and used. This is the clergy, the Russian Orthodox Church. I would draw attention to an interesting pattern: in both cases, the blow to the church preceded the campaigns of "pressure" on the peasantry. In the twentieth century, the church was robbed about 8-10 years before Collectivization. And in the 18th century, the Catherine's century of "developed serfdom" was preceded by the period of Peter (monks - into soldiers, priests - into civil service, bells - into cannons, and the church - a small egg, fortunately reached the "right moment").

This additional resource (the possibility of a forced "loan" from the peasantry and the church) remained in the hands of Catherine and the subsequent three emperors - Paul, Nicholas, Alexander, but ... the understanding of its temporality, borrowing, the need for its return and, most importantly, the need to direct this resource for solving national goals! Equipping the whole of Europe with these funds (and blood), and even according to completely ridiculous plans like the Holy Alliance, was an unforgivable (and unforgiven!) historical mistake.

And not even the peasants, but History itself presented this bill for payment. Yes, and fines and cruel interest were also calculated not by the peasants themselves, but, as if specially for this, a new class was born: the intelligentsia.

At lectures, I constantly repeat to students one apocryphal story: in that "suspended" period of Russian history (1762-1861), each emperor, dying, bequeathed to his heir his most secret plan, something like: "They didn't give me. But you - free the peasants!

The plot is beautiful, soothing, a kind of "historical diphenhydramine", but with each new layer of historical facts raised, it is harder and harder for me to repeat it. And when could this "political testament", the mandate of a dying man, take place? Who, where, to whom did he say? Catherine - on a toilet seat, made, as you know, from the former Polish royal throne, shouted to the heir locked in Gatchina? Or Pavel, hiding in the fireplace of the Mikhailovsky Castle moments before the "apoplexy ... with a snuffbox in the temple"? Or the restless Alexander in Taganrog?

Well, unless Nikolai T, dying on his soldier's bunk, could whisper this covenant to his son Alexander - he freed him!

The semantic balance of the state was restored 99 years + 1 day later by the "Manifesto of February 19, 1861" by Alexander the Liberator. But the fines and interest were really huge, and taking away from the nobles both the land and life itself according to plans "calling to the ax" was still a minimum, according to the revolutionary intelligentsia.

Two great reigns, Alexandrov Pi Sh, returned to the country a fair, balanced national structure, violated by the enslavement of the peasants and the liberation of the nobles. Once again, against the backdrop of the well-known tendency to oppose these monarchs - there are decent books on this topic - I emphasize: this is a single historical effort. And my images, likenings - a detour of the pit (left-right), a surgical operation (removed-sewn up) - I will back up with the words of Konstantin Leontiev from the book "East, Russia and Slavism": "Two state acts, February 19, 1861 (liberation of the peasants) and April 29, 1881 (Manifesto of Alexander III) complement each other.

The land issue has not been resolved, but the main thing is that the "patient" had to live. The peasant reform with absolute necessity was followed by a list of almost equally difficult reforms: military (peasants are no longer suppliers of recruits, compulsory military service), local self-government (nobles and their assemblies are no longer local rulers and judges) and, finally, judicial - introduction world courts and jury trials.

The outbreak of hysterical terror of the era of Alexander II with great difficulty, but was suppressed.

The second paradox of the Romanovs

...or rather our perception of the Romanovs. Among all the historical analyzes, he was forever forgotten, but almost never should have been

noted, realized an important fact, or, using the now popular lexicon, an absolute record: the Romanovs are the most successful dynasty of monarchs in all of European history. Here are the above accusations (?) from the file "Serfdom", and a brief introduction to the chapter "Antitsar", and the very title of the book - "At the Bottom of the Dynasty" ,, perhaps, sets the reader up for a "pamphlet" perception.

"Dno" refers to the unfortunate Nikolai P as an image (drinking to the bottom of the cup) and specifically topographically as the name of the city of Dno, Pskov province, associated with 1917, the abdication of the throne. Well, maybe also with the title of the most popular play by the then most fashionable author Maxim Gorky... But the mere presence of this "Bottom", the finale of the dynasty, cannot cancel the aforementioned "European record".

The great conventionality of interstate, interdynastic competitions, measurements of Success is understandable, but it is in this case that the measuring historian has something to rely on. And to clarify objectively: the Romanovs are a dynasty under which the state of Russia for 140 years has moved from the penultimate place to the first in Europe.

The fact is that just at the time when Russia, almost perishing in the Time of Troubles, with the first Romanov, Mikhail Fedorovich, was just crawling away from the edge of the abyss, the Thirty Years' War, 1618-1648, took place in Europe.

The peculiarity of that war was not only in its totality (the whole of Europe fought, even Sweden, which was neutral in both world wars of the twentieth century, was almost the main character). For example, for the German Reich (then still "first") in terms of the percentage of destruction and death of the population, the Thirty Years' War was much harder than both world wars taken together, Germany and the Czech Republic lost about 3/4 of the population. But the main thing for us is that the special war, which so terrified the surviving participants, ended in a completely special way, namely the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. It differed from all other peace treaties in its systemic nature, in its new philosophy (here the new at that time theory of natural law by Hugo Grotius came into play). The very idea of "state sovereignty" was first formulated in the Westphalian treatises, and from the point of view of international law, we still live in the Westphalian system. True, sometimes experts clarify that the Versailles 1918 and Yalta 1945 systems of international relations became a development, modifications of the Westphalian system.

And directly related to the "Romanov record" is that part of the Westphalian treatise in which Europe was codified for the first time in history, that is, the countries - owners of that very "state sovereignty" were first taken into account and recorded in ... descending order of international influence, strength. That is, it was the first European rating, and compiled NOT by journalists (although the semblance of newspapers had already appeared then), HER, as they say now,

"expert community", but by the monarchs themselves, diplomats, generals, armies. As a matter of fact, there was a war going on for a place in this rating! The Congress of Westphalia ran parallel to the still-on-going battles, much like the representatives of the United Nations gathered in San Francisco and formed the UN in 1944, still under the roar of the guns of World War II. And besides all the territorial gains / losses, the armies in the 1640s fought for: Who, with What title, after Whom and before Whom will sign that Peace of Westphalia. By the way, another analogy: in 1944, the countries (future) winners also compiled their own rating. And then getting into the "top five", among the five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council with the attached "Right of Veto" still brings the successor of the USSR, Russia, quite objective benefits.

BUT ... in the Ranking of Europe in 1648, Russia was in ... penultimate place, and the last was the Prince of Transylvania.

That's exactly why I devoted almost a page to these Westphalian details. I have been since the release of the book "World War II. Reboot" I try to rely on circumstantial evidence, dropped as if in passing. Direct statements, of course, are more detailed, deployed, but the realities of the age of propaganda-counter-propaganda have taught us not to trust such assessments. And here it is important that the Westphalian Congress met not because of Russia, not for her great humiliation.

I can almost see the indignant opponent: "What?! Russia penultimate?! At the very end, along with these ghouls, with this... Dracul's Transylvania! Yes, this is Russophobia!!"

But no, in Westphalia in 1648, the European nations gathered not on a Russian-slandering agenda, but on more important occasions for them: the end of the most terrible war in the history of mankind at that time and the construction of a new model of international relations (which is still valid today). By the way, historians, then it happened, argued: can Russia be considered a participant in the Thirty Years' War? If yes, to what extent and on whose side? Here it makes sense to recall our 10-volume "World History" of 1958, when all the wordings, assessments were carefully weighed, verified, as if in court or at the UN Assembly. The most verified assessment says: Russia was interested in the victory of the Anti-Habsburg League, but did not directly participate in the war, but sold bread and saltpeter to Protestant Holland, Denmark, Sweden at preferential prices, and ... planned to feed and pay for the Swedish army in its campaigns against Poland ... And that form of our

"participation" in the Thirty Years' War (hiring and feeding the Swedish army), already familiar, if we recall how, under Tsar Vasily Shuisky, the Swedish army of Delagardie was called to help for the return of part of the territory. This is not mentioned here at all by chance, it is also an essential brick in the building of the History of the Romanovs, illustration

dead end, helplessness of the then Russia. The fact that it was not at all on a whim that the Romanovs became modernizers.

And in the Thirty Years' War, let me remind you, they fought and lost big: the Habsburgs, Spain, all the Catholic countries of the world with the exception of France. Winners: Anti-Habsburg League, all Protestants in the world plus France. And since our worst enemy, Poland, was, of course, on the Catholic side, the victory of the Protestants was beneficial for Russia in the end. Which, in fact, happened, and was recorded in 1648. True, within this Thirty Years' War, Russia managed to openly fight, with Poland, of course. In the war for Smolensk of 1632-1634: the Russian army practically disappeared, dissolved in mud, the commander-in-chief Prince Shein was tried and executed. So Russia then managed to lose - to the losing side.

It is from these very points that the story explored in this book stretches: Smolensk-1632 and Troubles-1612, when the "Lisovchiks" - the Polish Sonder teams reached right up to Perm and Kholmogory ... (I will never tire of reminding the "Polish comrades" this fact. Already in three books, in several articles, on a variety of external occasions, from a review of Vladimir Khotinenko's film "1612" to a pamphlet about the investigation of the Smolensk plane crash ...) From that penultimate place, the Romanovs' Russia became the absolute leader of Europe, in time .. .

The Congress of Vienna in 1814, when Russia's leading position was indisputable, can be considered the second measuring point for this single breakthrough in world history. The phrase "First place in Europe and the world" may seem to have flown from a sports report, but if the "Westphalian list of states" were compiled in 1814, and not in 1648, Russia would certainly be generally recognized as the first, not the penultimate one. And by giving additional arguments, we can offer an earlier measuring point for the Russian, Romanov's throw: approximately 1788, when after the partition of Poland the huge heritage of Kievan Rus returned to us, and the "closest rival" France plunged into a funnel of crisis and death.

True, the Napoleonic empire soon became incredibly powerful, but from the point of view of centuries-old trends, it was from the point of view of the dynasties, Bourbons, Habsburgs, Romanovs (if we are talking about the successes / failures of the Dynasties) Bonapartes were a brief flash. And if the politicians of that time had watched today's films, they would probably compare Napoleonic France to zombies: an equally unusual force, but also a short existence.

For us, it is more important to note: already at the end of the 18th century, the Russia of the Romanovs became the most powerful country, it was to her that they ran for

With the help of the frightened Habsburgs, Hohenzollerns, Bourbons and ... our country, alas, got involved in the work that ended with the creation of the Second Reich, the hundred-year-old world leadership of Great Britain, but more on that later.

In general, no conscientious critic can deny the merit of the Romanov dynasty, the autocratic form of government in this period of rapid development unprecedented in world history. In the amazing gallery of the Romanovs, everyone could choose their "favorite", the idol of Romanov: the most refined poet, and the philosopher-educator, even a revolutionary, even the most limited historian, even Marx, even a Marxist, such as M. Pokrovsky - here, of course, Peter is at the service 1.

To place accents in a slightly new way, to group tsars, reigns, "court officials" in a different way, to show a slightly different border between Russian conservatives and liberals, between state work and treason - the purpose of this book.

Not by the upcoming 400th anniversary of the Romanov dynasty, but much earlier, as we usually do through some political scientists like Stanislav Belkovsky, a sounding of public opinion about the possible return of the monarchy in Russia, comparing the chances and rights of today's English Prince Harry (there is already a website "Harry - Russian Tsar"), the English distant relative of the Romanovs, Duke Michael of Kent and George, son of Leonida, called by competitors as Gog Hohenzollern ...

And the third paradox of the Romanovs...

So, unscrupulous cheating is to transfer "examples of slavery" to the entire history of Russia. And the real paradox is that the excesses of serfdom are directly related and chronologically exactly coincide with the period when Russia received the highest ratings in its history from Europe, from most of the humanists of the world, enlighteners, encyclopedic philosophers. This under-reported fact is important to consider for several reasons. Firstly, it is a pity that many patriots, using the example of Russophobic campaigns in Europe of the 20th century, have written down all enlighteners, European democrats as the original, eternal enemies of Russia, which is not at all the case. Secondly, it is also important to show that those likes and dislikes are by no means empty newspaper rustling, naked PR, etc. P.

For example, the fact that in the Northern War between Russia and Sweden in 1719-1720 England took an anti-Russian position, even sent a fleet to the Baltic with a formidable demonstration, is well known to everyone, there is already a popular phrase: "an Englishwoman crap". Combined with another popular phrase, the foreign policy creed: "England has no permanent allies, England has permanent interests" it would probably look like this: "An Englishwoman shits all the time."

But ... that in 1715-1716 England acted on the Russian side, and the fleets - their own and Holland (then sailing in the English fairway) -

sent to the Baltic and even transferred under the command of Peter - less is remembered. However ... there was such a naval campaign in 1716, when the Anglo-Dutch-Danish-Russian fleet was under the command of Peter,

69 courts (Russian - 22). No special victories were achieved, except for the fact that they forced the Swedish fleet to take refuge in Karlskrona for a year, but this is another matter. That campaign was still there, and the difference between it and the years of English hostility was only in successes / failures, diplomacy and ... PR (the English vector already then depended on Parliament, public opinion).

In the book *The Great Forgery, or A Short Course in the Falsification of History* (2010), I examined in detail the history of the European perception of Russia, starting with the mission of the papal envoy Anthony Possevino (1581-1582). To consider the current paradox, we confine ourselves to the framework of the 18th century.

Let's start with Montesquieu, who illustrates his theory of the dependence of history on geography with a Russian example: "Only despotic violence today connects all these wiped spaces together." Let's fix Montesquieu's nuance: not natural, "genetic slavery", but a consequence of the size of the state. Further, an important figure is Leibniz, who was eager for the Russian service, bombarding Peter with piles of "projects". Its slogan is simple, worthy of respect, direct and honest: "Where the arts and sciences are best treated, there will be my fatherland!"

Let's compare. Leibniz, in his 1669 pamphlet *Sample of Evidence*, on the occasion of the election of a king in Poland, writes why the Moscow candidate should not be elected: "Moscow ... the second Turkey. barbarian country. The Muscovites are even worse than the Turks! The horrors of the Livonian war (Livonian, Ivan the Terrible. - I. Sh.) were sworn to be confirmed and raise the question of whether it is possible to assume that such people are Christians. Woe to us if we open the way for them to Europe, disruption of our outpost, Poland!

Then the historical transformations of Peter begin, peasants, as you know, are attributed to factories, thousands of people are thrown from construction site to construction site.

And Leibniz is an ardent (and authoritative in Europe) supporter of Russia: "Our duty and happiness lie in, as far as it is in our power, to contribute to the kingdom of God, which - I have no doubt - consists in the widest dissemination of real virtue and wisdom. ... One such person (talking about Peter. - I.Sh.) to infuse zeal for the glory of God and the improvement of people means more than victory in a hundred battles ... Europe is now in a state of change and in such a crisis in which it does not have been since the time of Charlemagne's empire. (Charleman - Emperor Charlemagne).

It's already 1712. Let's pay tribute to Leibniz's intuition - enchanting

he foresaw the end of the 18th century and the collapse of feudal Europe before anyone else. As a result, Leibniz himself did not move to Russia, but Euler did, and more

dozens of the most useful people for whom Leibniz's opinion is a lot meant.

Together with the introduction of European education and culture to Russia, Leibniz has a political task - to maintain political balance, to balance the excessive French influence with a German-Russian alliance ... "The Tsar must establish a Russian Academy." In October 1711 they meet.

"I have never felt such a need for anything as for a great man who would rather want to take on such a thing ... Your Royal Majesty with such heroic projects will benefit and benefit an uncountable number of not only modern, but future people ... It seems special by God's providence that sciences bypass the earthly circle and now must come to Scythia and that Your Highness has been chosen this time as an instrument, for you, on the one hand, from Europe, and on the other, from China, take the best for yourself; and from what is done by both through good institutions, you can do even better. In your Empire, for the most part, everything related to research is new and, so to speak, on white paper, you can avoid countless mistakes that have gradually and imperceptibly taken root in Europe. It is known that a palace, built completely anew, comes out better than if they worked on it for many centuries, building, improving and changing a lot ... I consider heaven to be my fatherland, and all people of good will are its fellow citizens, so it's better for me to do a lot of good deeds Russians have less than Germans or other Europeans..."

Noble words. And if you use a mathematical term, the sympathies of Europe were then determined - by the Gradient of Enlightenment. That is, where the level of Enlightenment grew faster, their hopes and efforts rushed there.

Russia between the two main "Enlighteners"

But the loudest debate about Russia flared up with the exit to the podium of the two main orators of that century - Voltaire and Rousseau.

Let me remind you that in Russia at that time, serfdom was growing in depth and breadth, Ukrainians were becoming enslaved, and in part the newly acquired Belarusians. But when is an important, often forgotten moment! - Butchered Poland tried to win over European public opinion, the sympathy and support of the Enlightenmenters remained on the side of Catherine. The Poles received from France, from the Encyclopedists, only the draft Constitution. In fact, the instruction: take care, Poles, of your own civilization, in truncated sizes it will be for you

easier.

Depriving myself of the pleasure of describing all the nuances of their truly great Dispute about Russia, about Peter's reforms, I will confine myself here to a brief dotted line.

Rousseau: The Russians will never be truly civilized simply because they civilized too early. Peter had an imitative genius; he did not have that real genius that creates and creates everything from nothing ... He saw that he had a barbarian people, but he did not understand at all that this people was not ripe for culture; he wanted to civilize it, when he should only have been tempered for war ... He prevented his subjects from becoming what they could be, convincing them that they are what they are not

are.

Voltaire: The amazing successes of Empress Catherine and the entire Russian nation are strong enough evidence that Peter the Great built on a solid and lasting foundation.

Democrat Rousseau - sees the people, the natural development of which was crossed out by Peter.

Voltaire, the interlocutor of the monarchs, sees (in the place of the Russian people) material for the plans of an enlightened ruler.

Rousseau: The Tsar prevented the Russians from becoming what they could be.
Voltaire: Russian military successes are simply amazing.

But if you think about it, it's not so easy to decide who to write down as "ours", who as "Russophobes".

One sees great glory, and the other (pre) sees! Russia's great mistake. One thing is certain: for the political leadership of Russia in the 19th century, Rousseau's forecast would have been more useful. If he had been taken into account. After all, he speaks on behalf of a future real and victorious force: revolutionary democracy.

The fronts of this future great confrontation then, in the middle of the 18th century, were just being drawn. And Russia will fall into the worst enemies for two centuries ... revolutionaries, democrats, progressives (?) - the names do not matter, the main thing is that Russia fell into the enemies of those who unconditionally won.

And in general, one should not neglect the assessments of European experts, the scientific accuracy and effectiveness of their assessments should be respected. Hubert Langet, back in September 1558, wrote about Russia to Calvin: "If any kingdom in Europe should increase, it is only this"

And okay, the 18th century, where, as it turns out, Voltaire himself saw less than Rousseau saw. But the inertia of this erroneous policy brought

Even in the 10th century, Russia is already in such an abyss that if you conscientiously trace all the consequences, all the springs of history, then you must admit: the fanfare (at the level of the spree captains) of Alexander the First and both Nikolaev is hitting Russia to this day.

Further, citations are needed from the most significant book among those dealing with the history of Russia in the twentieth century, a real encyclopedia of Russian patriotism.

Danilevsky N. Ya. "Russia and Europe":

"But no matter how right Russia was in the division of Poland, now she already owns part of real Poland and, therefore, must bear the reproach of acquiring wrongly, at least on an equal footing with Prussia and Austria. Yes, unfortunately it does! But again, he owns not by conquest, but by that sentimental generosity that has just been spoken of. If Russia, having liberated Europe, provided Poland, partially restored by Napoleon, to its former fate, that is, to the division between Austria and Prussia, and in return for its invaluable, albeit poorly appreciated merits, demanded for itself eastern Galicia, part of which - the Tarnopol district - at that time already owned, she would have remained on the same ground on which she stood under Catherine, and no one could reproach her for anything. Russia would receive much less in terms of space, not much less in terms of population, but how much more in terms of internal dignity acquired, since she would increase the number of her subjects not with a hostile Polish element, but with the real Russian people ...

What made Emperor Alexander lose sight of this significant benefit? What blinded his eyes? Not aggressive plans at all, but the desire to fulfill his youthful dream - to restore the Polish nationality and thereby make amends for what seemed to him the misdeed of his great grandmother. That this was indeed the case is proved by the fact that the Poles themselves looked at it this way. When from the hostile camp, from Austria, France and England, all kinds of obstacles began to be made to this plan for the restoration of Poland, threatening even with war, Emperor Alexander sent Grand Duke Constantine to Warsaw to call the Poles to arms in defense of their national independence. Europe, as usual, saw in this a cunning on the part of Russia - a desire, under the pretext of restoring the Polish nationality, to gradually take over those parts of the former Polish kingdom that did not belong to it - and therefore agreed to the complete incorporation of Poland, but not in any way for the independent existence of the Kingdom in a personal dynastic union with Russia, which is now so desired. Only when Hardenberg, who, like a Prussian, was more familiar with Polish and Russian affairs, explained that Russia was demanding its own harm (*italics mine*. - I. 1.), did the diplomats agree to

independence of the kingdom. Subsequent events proved that Russia's plans were not ambitious, but only generous. Insurrection

(Poles) cannot be explained by anything else than the annoyance of the Poles at the failure to implement their plans to restore the ancient greatness of Poland, even if it was under the scepter of Russian sovereigns. But these plans were directed not to Galicia and Poznan, but to western Russia, because here only the hands of the Polish intelligentsia were untied - to speak Polish and Latin as much as they wanted. And only when, in the opinion of the Polish intelligentsia, there was not enough indulgence or, better to say, the assistance of the Russian government - for indulgence was still enough to polonization of Western Russia (*italics mine*. - I. Sh.), then the indignation of the Poles flared up and led to the uprising of 1830, as well as 1863. This is how ambitious and conquering were the plans of Russia, which prompted her to harass at the Congress of Vienna the annexation of the Kingdom of Poland!

All this state nonsense ("sentimental" according to Danilevsky, he , what, by excuses Tsar Alexander), among other things, is another proof of a fact that is relevant even for 2010. Today's alienation of Ukrainians from Russians comes from that century of keeping Poland to itself. In the book "10 Myths about Ukraine" I examine this process in more detail and more convincingly ... "secondary "Ukrainization" of South-Western Rus'." There is serious evidence of where the first "independents" came from in the era of Alexander G. However, we will continue to quote Danilevsky:

"Is it not because of Europe, therefore, because of Germany in particular, that Russia took the storm of the twelfth year on her chest? The twelfth year was, in fact, a great political mistake, turned by the spirit of the Russian people into a great national triumph.

That Russia did not have any of her own interests in mind when deciding to fight Napoleon is evident from the fact that, having ended the first act of this struggle with unparalleled glory, she did not stop, did not take advantage of the opportunity presented to her to achieve everything she could. to wish for himself, having concluded peace and an alliance with Napoleon, as he sought this by all means and as Kutuzov and many other remarkable people of that era desired the same. What prevented Alexander from repeating Tilsit with the only difference that this time he would play a paramount and most honorable role? <...>

The year 1848 has come. The upheavals that were at that time in the whole of Europe untied the hands of the conqueror and the ambitious. How did Russia take advantage of this unique position? She saved her neighbor (Austria) from death. <...>

I turn to another capital charge against Russia. Russia is a quencher of light and freedom, a dark, gloomy force... The famous Rottek expressed an idea - which, not having his "History" at hand,

I cannot, unfortunately, literally quote - that any success of Russia, any development of its internal forces, an increase in its prosperity and power is a social disaster, a misfortune for all mankind. This opinion of Rottek is only an expression of the public opinion of Europe (*italics mine*. - I. Sh.).

And this is again based on the same sand as the ambition and conquest of Russia. Whatever the form of government in Russia, whatever the shortcomings of the Russian administration, the Russian judicial system, the Russian fiscal system, etc. all this, I suppose, no one cares, as long as she does not seek to impose all this on others ...

So, the composition of the Russian state, the war it waged, the goals it pursued, and even more - favorable circumstances, repeated so many times, which it did not think to take advantage of - all show that Russia is not an ambitious, not an aggressive power, that in the latest during the period of its history, for the most part, it sacrificed its most obvious benefits, the most just and legitimate, European interests.

Whence and for what, I ask, distrust, injustice, hatred towards Russia on the part of the governments and public opinion of Europe? ..

After the Congress of Vienna, according to the idea of the Russian emperor, Russia, Austria and Prussia concluded the so-called Holy Alliance, to which all sovereigns of Europe were invited to join. This Holy Alliance is the main accusation against Russia and is presented as a conspiracy of sovereigns against their peoples (*italics mine*. - I. Sh.). But in this union, one must strictly distinguish the idea, the original plan, which alone belonged to Alexander, from the practical implementation, which is the inalienable property of Metternich. There was, of course, nothing oppressive in the original idea, whatever its practical merits. The Emperor Alexander unquestionably stood for the constitutional principle wherever, in his opinion, popular development allowed its application. He was an opponent and enemy of the parties forcibly compelled by rebellion and revolution...

The root of all the reactionary, retrograde measures of that time was Austria and its ruler Metternich, who, entangling everyone with his networks, including Russia, forced the latter to abandon its natural and national policy of helping the Greeks and Turkish Christians in general against their oppressors - to refuse in spite of all her traditions, all her interests, all the sympathies of her sovereign and her people. Russia was also a victim of Metternich's policy; why, then, and not on Austria, which was the culprit of everything and in whose favor all this was done, is the whole burden of guilt thrown upon her? <...>

Is it not the influence of Metternich that is attributed to the change in the way of thinking that took place in Emperor Alexander after 1822? Isn't this

influence was the cause of the disfavor of Kapodistrias, the hostile attitude adopted towards Greece and in general towards national politics, finally, was it not this influence that caused the very change in the direction of public education in the time of Shishkov and Magnitsky? And then, if not for the sake of Austria, any moral help to the Slavs was considered almost Russian

state crime?

Well, how do you like it? Feeling: a slow, solemn entry into the Yellow House... Or - a slow-motion movie replay of the process of the mind going behind the mind.

Relatively new to the reader here will probably be the last passage, that, it turns out, our autocrat Alexander, stretched like a doll on the hand of that same Metternich, not only laid down Russian foreign policy at the feet of Austria - it would also correspond to at least some semantic reality. A successful conspiracy is still a reality: after all, it is beneficial, having fooled an enemy power, to force it to conduct several wars entirely for its own benefit and to the detriment of itself! BUT ... SO use this "implantation on Metternich's hand - a monarch doll" in order to also stick into the contents of their , Russian school textbooks, the schedule of classes at their universities?!

But no matter how much you sharpen this point with Danilevsky, the sad paradox is that there is no other explanation for those Alexandrov ... actions (the word "politics" is difficult to apply here) at all.

That is why I emphasized the expert opinion of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who predicted that Russia would be drawn into a conflict with democratic Europe (which at that time, in the middle of the 15th century, was still only in a distant, distant project!). And a century later, Danilevsky indignantly states: "The public opinion of Europe: Russia is a disaster, a misfortune for all mankind."

And 250 years later, aren't we convinced every day: in whose hands is the public opinion of Europe? The bet - the Holy Alliance - was made on the euromonarchs - and now ...

"A fell, B disappeared - who was left on the pipe?"

Maybe today the princes of Liechtenstein and Monaco will remember the sacrifices made by Russia to the euromonarchs and help?

Chapter 3

(rise 1856-1894 and slide into the Silver Age)

So. The period of borrowed power, the receipt of a significant resource at the disposal of Catherine, Paul, Alexander and Nicholas after the decision (Catherine) of the most important geopolitical tasks of Russia ended with an almost insane, unprecedented in history oblivion of national interests, half a century of serving the Holy Alliance, serving the Order of Malta, Prussia, England, Austria and as a result of the catastrophe of the Crimean War.

But then the history of Russia gives an example of the Great Overcoming. Two outstanding reigns, Alexandrov Pi Sh, returned to the country a fair, balanced national structure, after which the national foreign policy naturally returned. This, I emphasize once again, is a single historical effort, which I likened to a detour of a deep pit: the steering wheel to the left (Alexander PJ) - the steering wheel to the right (Alexander I), with the most complicated surgical operation: one was cut, removed, the second was sewn up. But, again: the "patient" had to LIVE.

The historian Vasily Klyuchevsky wrote about Emperor Alexander I:

"Science will give the Emperor a proper place ... in the history of Russia and all of Europe ... will say that He won in the area where it is most difficult to achieve victory, defeated the prejudice of peoples and thereby contributed to their rapprochement, conquered the public conscience in the name of peace and truth, increased the amount of goodness in the moral circulation of mankind, sharpened and raised Russian historical thought, Russian national consciousness, and did all this so quietly and

silently..."

The long-awaited growth of the country's material power has surpassed the most optimistic forecasts. The great Russian scientist and administrator, the head of the metrological service he created, Dmitry Ivanovich Mendeleev, together with his associates, a close acquaintance of the Minister Sergei Yulievich Witte, Admiral Chikhachev, introduced new smokeless gunpowder, new types of ships, monopoly vodka, networks of state-owned factories. Dmitry Ivanovich Mendeleev, to all his merits, also the largest scientist-economist defined the reign of Alexander III as the best period in the history of Russian industry. From 1881 to 1896, industrial production in Russia increased 6.5 times. Output per worker - by 22%. (The same "labor productivity" that the Bolsheviks kept talking about the need to increase.) From 1890 to 1900, the power of steam engines in Russian industry increased from 125,100 hp. With. before

1,294,500 I. With. - growth of 300%.

"The Russian Empire literally shuddered from the heavy pace of industrial progress: a seismic station in Riga recorded

a two-point earthquake, when at the Izhora plant in St. Petersburg, the second in Europe in terms of power after the Krupp one in Germany, a press with a force of 10,000 tons bent armor plates "- I found this expressive touch in V. Lapin's book "Petersburg. Smells and sounds. And literally in the same line, as the author of the book about the Golitsyns, I would add that the seismograph itself, which is still working today, was created at the same time by Prince Boris Borisovich Golitsyn, an invention recognized by the world, fortunately, unconditionally.

Of the contemporary tsars, Mendeleev respected Alexander III the most:

"Peacemaker Alexander III foresaw the essence of Russian and world destinies more and more than his contemporaries. (This is written by a man who himself foresaw the elemental structure of the universe. - I. Sh.) People who lived through his reign clearly realized that then a certain degree of restrained concentration and gathering of forces had come, directed from the brilliant, even bright transformations and innovations of the previous glorious reign - to simple everyday inner activities. World peace, created by the late emperor, as the highest common good, and indeed strengthened by his good will among the peoples participating in progress. The universal recognition of this will fall like an unfading wreath on his grave and, we dare to think, will give good fruits everywhere ... "

From the "Treasured Thoughts" DC. I. Mendeleev: "There was no noise and brilliance, but important and difficult things were done."

A worthy crown of the era of "steel Russia", of all "Two Alexandria" - the largest railway in the history of mankind - the Trans-Siberian.

But just at the time when Russia was powerfully overgrown with steel armor, invisible, but fatal cracks ran through its "spiritual armor". The process, which ended with the death of the country, expressively showed the connection and even dependence of the strength of "steel armor" on "spiritual". This process led, among many other things, to the fact that the Russian armored carrier "Emperor Nicholas 1" lowered the flag in the Tsushima battle and served as a Japanese training ship, ending its life as a target ship ...

Chapter 4. Russian hysterical terror Let's go back to the period - 35 years before the fall of the empire. An outbreak of hysterical terror in the era of Alexander II with a huge

with difficulty, but was suppressed. "Hysterical" (i.e. "uterine") Russian terror I called here not only in defiance of its heroizers,

but also to draw attention to an undeniable phenomenon - the huge proportion of women in terrorist organizations. If you set a goal, to calculate the proportion of women in all the then bodies, corporations, social groups: the army, medical personnel, students, smugglers, artists ... - I am sure that their share in revolutionary organizations will be the largest. In the most famous terrorist list - "First March", the killers of Alexander P - of the six sentenced to hanging, two women, Perovskaya and Gelfand (pardoned due to pregnancy).

Suggestibility, imitation, low ability of critical perception... - of course yes. Would you like a somewhat unexpected juxtaposition? - Medieval trials of: witches and... witchers

less!). Not only by torture, but, as many researchers have proved, and - by imitation, by hysterical self-incrimination, the number of witches then multiplied ...

Two high-profile trials - the Zasulich Case in 1878 and the murder of Alexander P in 1881, and, most importantly, the public reaction to them, largely undermined the course of state life, reduced the work of generations to nonsense. On the first case, I will add one new emphasis, but first, excuse me, a portion of known facts.

Vera Zasulich is an acquaintance, an employee of Sergei Nechaev himself (the main "demon" of our history). True, the retouchers of her appearance keep talking about disagreements with Nechaev and their very limited cooperation. Then, in the group "Rebels-Bakuninists", she tried to raise a peasant uprising in the Chigirinsky district of the Kyiv province with the help of fake tsar manifestos.

In July 1877, after a riot in the prison, the governor of St. Petersburg Trepov ordered the flogging of the recalcitrant prisoner Bogolyubov, in January 1878, six months later, Vera Zasulich shoots the governor.

The Minister of Justice, Count Pahlen, having many completely legal options up to the transfer of the case to the Military Court, gives it to the jury. Chairman of the St. Petersburg District Court - 33-year-old, famous in the future A.F. Koni ...

Pobedonostsev: "Going to a jury with such a case, in the midst of such a society as St. Petersburg, is no joke."

Lawyer Alexandrov inspired and inspired the jury: "Sympathy for the punished Bogolyubov justifies the terrorist"... The announcement of the verdict ended with the words: "Not guilty ..." - Shouts of joy, hysterical sobs, desperate applause, footsteps, exclamations of "Bravo! Hooray! Well done! They hugged each other, kissed, climbed over the railing to Alexandrov and Zasulich, congratulated. The lawyer was rocked, and then carried out of the courtroom in his arms and carried to Liteinaya Street.

When Zasulich left the house of preliminary detention, she fell into the arms of the crowd. To joyful cries, they threw her up.

Russian lawyer N. I. Karabchevsky: "The defense of Vera Zasulich made the lawyer Alexandrov world famous. His speech was translated into foreign languages. The newspapers of France, Germany, England, the USA, Italy, the entire civilized world are delighted: Law and Humanity have won in Russia.

Zasulich, lawyer Alexandrov, chairman of the court Koni are the heroes of the day. The next day after her release, the verdict was protested, an order was issued for the arrest of Zasulich, but she hid in a safe house and soon, in order to avoid re-arrest, was secretly

shipped to Sweden. In 1880 Zasulich in Paris. Collaborates with Plekhanov, Lenin...

I propose to reflect on what all the time seemed simple and natural: Zasulich's transition to an illegal position, emigration to Europe ... preempting the re-examination of her case. Everything seems to be correct, the usual rotation of the time: terrorist attack, trial, emigration, underground.

BUT ... after all, Europe and the USA then welcomed - the Triumph of the Law in Russia! What "Triumph" all over the world involves the consideration of the case in several instances. What seems to be simpler: the district court decided, the regional one can overrule, then the Supreme Court ... But Europe, together with our revolutionaries and liberals, having received the necessary decision of the first instance, the Petersburg District Court ... steals and hides Zasulich from subsequent equally legitimate courts.

Here is a picture that somewhat exaggerates this logic: the European liberals squeezed out the decision they needed at first instance, carried the lawyer and the defendant out of the court building to hysterical screams in their arms, took them away, and ... - an atomic bomb on all this Petersburg, so that the prosecutor's office is there and did not protest that the "Triumph of the Law" would certainly be final. The meaning of the caricature: both the bombing of Petersburg, and stealing, harboring the accused are factors that equally violate the legal course of the trial. And it is amazing (I checked): for all 130 years (!) the history of the Zasulich case has not been considered by anyone from this side. Which obscures the essence and initial conditions of the dispute with the liberals.

This bold combination of any measures reminded me of the history of Lenin's struggle against the liquidators and otzovists in the RSDLP. The first said: "We went to the State Duma. We now have some kind of faction: five people! (Counting, as it turned out later, a police agent.) So, it is necessary to liquidate the underground shop. Second: "No, we must recall the comrades from the Duma and continue to engage in honest, arguing about the future of terror." The liquidators, together with the otzovists of the party, pulled Lenin in their very direction. The leader's decision was

symptomatic, truly revolutionary, unexpected. In my opinion, it was it that paved the way, if we recall the hackneyed wording, to the "party of a new type."

He decided to leave both. A new level of morality, the omnipotence of "Combination": during the day, for example, argue in the Duma, quoting Plato, Montesquieu, and at night plant a bomb under the opponent's bed ...

Zasulich was in the party of Lenin, in the editorial office of the Iskra newspaper (though later she switched to the Mensheviks). Maybe, looking thoughtfully at the shabby personality of the old terrorist, remembering the "Casus Zasulich", the applause of the world to the Triumph of the Law with the simultaneous stealing, harboring of the terrorist, the leader just thought out that decision,

which surprised both the liquidators and the otzovists. How to know!

In 1878, at Count Palen's home ball, the "brought from work", that is, the photographs "of a romantic criminal who almost shot the mayor because of her lover" were a huge success. So Minister Palen caught "his 5 minutes of fame."

She became a youth idol. Female students, governesses, probably, and milliners dreamed of repeating the "feat of Zasulich". Now Russian mayors could be shot with impunity. French, German, English, of course, no. Their Law "with ardent sympathy that pushed to a terrorist attack ..." cannot be bypassed, guillotines and gallows in Europe both worked and worked. But the savages got two toys in their hands at once: a multi-shot revolver and a jury trial, now they will definitely smash their state.

Prince Meshchersky, publisher of the Grazhdanin magazine, wrote: "The acquittal of Zasulich took place as if in some kind of nightmare, no one could understand how such a terrible mockery of state superior servants, such a brazen triumph of sedition could take place in the courtroom of the autocratic empire."

Before his dismissal, the Minister of Justice, Palen, persuaded Koni to resign for a long time: he could not fire him! "Independence of the judiciary" is another toy. But Koni did not leave, collecting the laurels of a liberal, a fighter against the autocracy, for another 20 years. Zasulich died in 1919 and was buried at the Volkovskoye cemetery, Literary Mostki site, next to Plekhanov. Later, at the Literary Bridges, not far from the grave of Zasulich, the ashes of Koni, transferred from the Tikhvin cemetery of the Alexander Nevsky Lavra, were reburied.

Well, the cleansing of the territory of the Lavra can, of course, be welcomed, but ... all this is sad, gentlemen.

Philosophical hysteria

Three years passed, terror became a secular fashion, and in 1881 Tsar Alexander II was killed. The terrorists were on trial, and on the eve of the sentencing in St. forgive. If he is a Christian, he must forgive. If he is the real leader of the people, he must forgive. If state power embarks on a bloody path, we will renounce it." Witnesses: "It is impossible to convey what was going on in the hall. Some kind of mass ecstasy. Enthusiastic youth carried the orator in their arms ... "

Do not think that that speech was a single outburst: well, the philosopher wanted to ride on the "hands of enthusiastic youth" meters

thirty from the pulpit to the wardrobe, or a little further, along the route of Zasulich and her lawyer ... No, all the many years, it is even surprising how still unappreciated the work of Solovyov is the destruction of the meaning of Russian statehood. It was he who extended the fuse from the era of terrorism, Nechaev, Zasulich, their hysterical imitators to the last two reigns of Imperial Russia.

Recognition of the enormous significance of the philosopher Solovyov can be found in the works of his followers: Berdyaev, Bulgakov, Frank, Andrei Bely, Blok ... in general, those who gave this significance a different, opposite sign. Solovyov "stood at the origins of the Russian "spiritual revival" of the early twentieth century, the "Russian spiritual renaissance" (N. Berdyaev). Elsewhere, Berdyaev called this "renaissance" the Silver Age. Although the exact authorship of the term "Silver Age" is still being discussed (both Makovsky and Otsup are named), it has been more or less proven, and the "Smenovekhovites" are especially convincing that this "renaissance" spiritually prepared the catastrophe of 1917. Finding out the role of Solovyov's influence is just crossing out one "suddenly" in the history of Russia, namely: "For some reason, during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 ... it suddenly turned out that a significant part of the Russian public was furiously rooting for the Japanese, applauding, transmit every news of their victories, constantly exaggerate the losses of the Russian troops, creating a certain pressure on the government.

Somehow, experts Shiryayev and Smirnov in one program of the Historical Channel convincingly revealed false arithmetic, the mechanics of distorting the numbers of our and Japanese losses in 1905 ... But where did the very stratum of Russian society suddenly come from, energetically spreading these false numbers? This is really strange, especially when compared with public opinion in Russia in 1812 or 1878 (the Russian-Turkish war). In just 25 years, such suddenly radical changes! Or why in 1915-1917 many Russians suddenly began to wish for the defeat of their army and act according to the principle "the worse, the better"? These are all questions to the rulers of the thoughts of the Silver Age, the "Solovievites".

The historical importance, the effectiveness of Solovyov's ultimatum: The Tsar must forgive the terrorists, the real leader of the if he is a Christian people, otherwise we will renounce him, condensed, as in a chemical reaction, according to the formula:

Zhelyabov + Solovyov = public opinion.

Sergei Kravchinsky wrote about the image of a revolutionary terrorist: "He is beautiful, formidable, irresistibly charming, as he combines both the highest types of human greatness: a martyr and a hero."

L. Mirsky attempted on the chief of the gendarmes Drenteln in order to attract the attention of his beloved girl, who "had a purely romantic delight in front of Kravchinsky", earlier we killed Drenteln's predecessor, Mezentshev, in broad daylight on a crowded street.

Apollinaria Suslova, the ex-patron of Dostoevsky, and then Rozanov, argued to Fyodor Mikhailovich that for the insult inflicted on her once by a man "... it doesn't matter which man pays for the abuse of me. Why not the king himself? How simple, just think - one gesture, one movement, and you are in a host of celebrities, geniuses, great people, saviors

humanity."

You see, even 80 years before the birth of the term RK, "PR", Apollinaria grasped the very essence: it doesn't matter on whom to vent the old grudge, but ... if on the king, then you will also find yourself ... in a host of celebrities, geniuses. .. The English term tagKea reore, literally "marked people", is used by PR specialists in the sense of designating a category of people already tshagkea, marked by society, the market (in this case it is similar: society = market of news consumers). Entering into any sort of tag reore relationship, one can become a tag reore itself, like Zasulich and Solovyov. Like Mark Chapman - John Lennon's killer...

Yes, this feminist-terrorist was probably the second hard labor for Fyodor Mikhailovich. In the case of PR-Apollinaria, this is a way of thinking, characteristic, but not becoming a way of action. Or maybe this is my psychological hypothesis: instead of the tsar, she used Dostoevsky, and then Vasily Rozanov, as a shagkea reorle. Here another interesting semi-absurd plot appears: Fyodor Mikhailovich took upon himself the psychopathic blow of Apollinaria, thereby shielding the tsar with his chest. Like "Life for the Tsar" -2.

Herzen wrote in his "The Bell": "There are moments in the life of nations in which the whole moral life is shaken, all nerves are raised, and life and one's own life cost so little to a person that he becomes a murderer."

V. M. Bekhterev explained the statistically recorded wave of youth suicides at the beginning of the 20th century as a social disease, in addition to

oppressive personality affect associated with the processes of modernization of society, the power of example and the general pessimistic mood of the minds.

Collection "To Help Youth" (Kyiv, 1910): "... In the younger generation, confusion and depression, weakening of the will to live, desperate disappointment and oppressive loneliness ... There are such periods and conditions in history when it becomes especially easy to be disappointed with life and comfortable, and maybe fashionable.

Examples of Vera Zasulich, Solovyov and his stunned listeners, "PR-Apollinaria", Sofya Perovskaya, Kalyaevs and others

L. Mirskikh... this intertwining of psychiatry with politics attracted the attention of not only the coryphaeus Bekhterev. On "hysterical terror" I will add a couple of remarks.

In the case of Vera Zasulich, what detail was, alas, underestimated? Personally, in my opinion, the most important thing in her "case history" is the six-month gap, the interval between the external Cause (reason) and the Deed.

On July 13, 1877, Governor Trepov ordered the rebellious prisoner Bogolyubov to be whipped. January 24, 1878 Zasulich shoots the governor. The term, in my opinion, is sufficient to completely discard the fables of the lawyer Alexandrov, picked up by public opinion, about the "noble impulse", that she suddenly "felt an insult to the prisoner - as to herself personally."

These six months are a kind of "incubation period" for her illness. "Wound up", tried on, just like Apollinaria Suslova tried on all her life. An interesting difference: Apollinaria still did not fire. In my opinion, it was influenced by the fact that, having such listeners, interlocutors as Dostoevsky, Rozanov, she spoke out, lowered the tension on her partners. And the lonely ugly Vera Zasulich is not so

lucky.

Reference book: "Ister ya (other - Greek 'Notera (Vu \$ ega) - "womb"); Uterine rabies is an outdated medical diagnosis that currently corresponds to a range of mild to moderate mental disorders."

Plato: "Hysteria is a frenzy into which the uterus of a woman falls, not being able to conceive."

Modern psychiatry: "Hysterical personality disorder. He is characterized by superficiality of judgments, suggestibility and self-hypnosis, a tendency to fantasize, instability of mood, the desire to attract attention, theatricality of behavior.

The hysterism of the Russian terror, which just one misprint can turn into "historicism," is especially clearly visible if you step over the clichés of our textbooks, where "Foreign Policy" and "Revolutionary Democratic Movement" are always divided into separate chapters.

The latter is, as always: Zhelyabov Perovskaya, Zasulich, their lawyers Alexandrov (in the narrow judicial sense), VI. Solovyov (in the all-Russian ideological).

But the Russian-Turkish war fell under the "Foreign policy of tsarism" of that period. What was this war?

Painfully reforming, following the liberation of the peasants, Russia also broke the centuries-old "recruit" army. War Minister

Milyutin has recently begun to create an army on the basis of universal military service. But the next news about the Turkish massacre of Christians in the Balkans makes us forget about reforms. The country (the penultimate time in history!) is united in a common impulse. Slavic committees collect donations, doctors Sklifosovsky, Pirogov, Botkin, writers Garshin, Gilyarovsky, artist Polenov leave for the war. Sixty-year-old Turgenev said: "If I were younger, I would go there." The hero of the Crimean War, the future great opponent of the tsarist government, fifty-year-old Leo Tolstoy, is also going: "All of Russia is there, and I must go."

And, bringing together the initially "divorced themes": revolutionaries, Narodnaya Volya S. M. Kravchinsky, D. A. Klements, M. P. Sazhin, V. F. Kostyurin, A. P. Korba also volunteered for the Balkans. Several of them: A. G. Eroshenko, D. A. Goldstein, K. N. Bogdanovich - died in that war.

The capture of Plevna on November 28, 1877 broke the Turks - the only salvation was a winter break and the hope of England intervening. Friend and idol VI. Solovyov, Pope Leo XIII gathers an anti-Russian coalition, blessing Turkish weapons: "The sooner schism (Orthodoxy) is suppressed, the better ... the hand of God can also lead the bashi-bazouk sword (the main thugs of the Turkish army)." Russia was teetering on the brink of a new "Crimean" war, with a new coalition. The enormous efforts of Gorchakov's Russian diplomacy (the convention with Austria...) could ensure a relative, unfriendly, but still neutrality for about one year of the war. Further, as it was calculated, the strength of the indignation of the British public - the Turkish massacre began to give way to geopolitical reasons, and Britain planned the "Crimean War 2". The released year expired in April 1878, and in winter the Balkan passes, according to military experts from all over the world, are impassable. Moltke, Chief of the General Staff of Germany, allowed the German military observers to go on vacation for the winter. Chancellor Bismarck,

jealously following Russia's progress, he folded a map of the Balkan Peninsula in his office and said that he would not need it until spring.

War Minister Milyutin recommended to decide on a winter throw, "to prevent the intervention of the Western powers in defense of Turkey." And the transition became one of the most difficult in the history of wars. Soldiers with incredible effort dragged guns over the icy rocks. Often they fell into the abyss along with people and horses.

The historian Troitsky wrote: "General Gurko was told that artillery could not even be raised by hand on one of the passes. Gurko ordered: "Pull it in with your teeth!" - and dragged ... Having crossed the Balkans, the Russian troops went to Constantinople. The Turks, in a last attempt to stop ours, fought a battle near Philippopolis (present-day Plovdiv) on January 15-17, 1878, but were defeated. On February 11, Skobelev occupied the place of San Stefano, 12 versts from Constantinople. Russian officers were already looking through telescopes at the sights of the Turkish capital ... "

In San Stefano, a peace treaty was signed with Turkey. But England and Austria-Hungary threaten a new coalition and war. Taking into account this and the internal political situation (a surge of terror!), Russia agrees to sign a completely different peace in Berlin, which significantly devalues the exploits of its army ...

Further, I propose to consider the events of this year - in a single stream, as if leafing through the pages of the diary of an attentive contemporary of the events. No comment (well, almost no comment):

February 20, 1877. Premiere of the ballet "Swan Lake" by P. I. Tchaikovsky.

March 4, 1877. The first issue of female doctors in Russia. April 24, 1877. The beginning of the Russian-Turkish war. July 1, 1877. First Wimbledon tennis tournament.

July 13, 1877. Riot in the prison, after which the governor Trepov ordered the flogging of the prisoner Bogolyubov.

August 9, 1877. Beginning of the heroic defense of Shipka in the Russian-Turkish war.

November 28, 1877. Capture of Plevna by the Russians. A turning point in the course of the war.

January 9, 1878. After a five-month siege, the victory of the Russians at Shipka Sheinovo, the capture of the Turkish army.

January 11, 1878. Solemn funeral of the Russian poet N. A. Nekrasov. (Here, too, not without hysteria. When one writer in

mournful speech put Nekrasov next to Pushkin, a crowd of students yelled: "Higher! Higher! Nekrasov is taller than Pushkin!"

January 14, 1878. On the Batumi roadstead, the Russian boats "Chesma" and "Sinop" sink a Turkish ship with self-propelled mines (torpedoes). The first torpedo attack in history.

January 20, 1878. The Russian army occupies Adrianople.

January 24, 1878. Revolutionary Vera Zasulich shoots the St. Petersburg mayor F. Trepov, declaring this revenge for the flogging of prisoner Bogolyubov.

February 19, 1878. Signing of the San Stefano Provisional

peace treaty between Russia and Turkey.

July 13, 1878. The Berlin Congress ended, where Russia was forced to sign a treaty that significantly changed (for the worse for us) the terms of the San Stefano Treaty.

As always in such situations, the "peace treaty equation" was decided taking into account the importance of the main variables: military results, diplomatic pressure, internal stability = the country's ability to continue the war. Brilliant military successes (the army stands near Istanbul) were partly balanced by the diplomatic pressure of England, Austria, Germany, but the internal situation of Russia, rampant terror inspired by the victory in the Zasluch case, became a powerful factor that "twisted hands" on our side in the negotiations. Here is the connection between different "shelves": that Zasluch shot was three days after the capture of Adrianople, the achievement by the Russian army of the highest point in all (strictly counting) 300 years of Turkish wars.

Chapter 5. History and hysteria

But to what extent were Solovyov and his adherents, the Silver Age decadents, the culprits, and to what extent were they only passive chanters of the social crisis? The question is intractable, in fact it is a projection of more general, "eternal" questions about ... "the ratio of subjective and objective reasons", about "the role of the individual in history", "about the primacy of spirit or matter ... chicken or egg". One thing is known for sure: the ideological and philosophical source, from which rays of influence stretched up to the most ordinary decadent tavern concert, a scandalous action, was the philosopher Solovyov. His influence over time and organizationally took shape in the form of the Moscow Religious and Philosophical Society named after V. Solovyov (Berdyayev, Bulgakov, A. Bely, Vyach. Ivanov, E. N. Trubetskoy, Ern, Florensky ...).

And public opinion, synthesized according to the Zhelyabov + Solovyov formula
, formed a new generation of the ruling class,

politicians, officials, or rather, their critical mass that broke through and washed away the Russian Empire. People of this formation, if they got into the civil service, they acted without inner conviction, without love for the state. And if they were - in the Zemstvos, the State Duma, in blocs and parties, then they managed to be remembered by the whole world. They "renounced" the tsar, divided the portfolios (the funny thing is that they called it a "responsible cabinet of ministers", the slogan was like that), in a few months they ruined the state, fled and admitted in emigration: "But we thought that we were still should have been guarded by the tsarist gendarmes.

The decadents, the Silver Age, the "Solovievites" (that, by the way, was also called Blok, and he proudly bore this title) will be devoted to a separate chapter - "Melchior Age" by Vladimir Solovyov.
, and here I will pay attention to the philosopher himself

Among the difficulties of the dispute about his philosophy, the first, on the surface, the basic idea of religious philosophy, Sophia, the Soul of the World, was revealed to Solovyov "in a mystical vision." So Wikipedia cites the words of Daniil Andreev that "Soloviev is the only Russian philosopher who deserves this name without any exaggeration." Tsa, Daniil Andreev, of course, is an authoritative seer (visionary), he himself has the "Rose of the World".

Solovyov and his clack mixed philosophical systems, mystical revelations and ... seances to the consistency of a paste. Despite the fact that in general this fashionable fad, spiritualism, "table-turning" (a kind of "Dom-2" of the 19th - early 20th centuries) has long been studied and placed, as it should, next to the circus, fair "ventriloquism" and everything else, however, Solovyov's "medium notes" are published and studied.

It is difficult to object to Solovyov at the appropriate level. For example, I immediately admit that I didn't have any mystical countervisions in which some lady would say to me: "Sofia Solovyova is a bluff, an accidental empty fiction." And manipulations with opening books, trembling turning scissors, turning tables - I saw only in the movies.

The second difficulty of the dispute is that, again, I confess, I have not read all of Solovyov's works. This reminds me of the old institute formulation of the question. Once I recklessly refuted Karl Marx: "After all, from his "Capital" he deduced the relative and absolute impoverishment of the proletariat. And from the double impoverishment brought the world revolution, the leading role of the proletariat. This is nonsense! The intelligent Professor Murzov sighed: "Igor, well, you haven't read the entire Capital, how can you refute it?" I gnawed the first volume in excitement, where there are still formulas and a certain logical chain, and suddenly I see, I understand: there are still 3 (three) left! I indignantly object to the professor: "And if I wrote 44 volumes of deliberate nonsense, I would be even more invulnerable, requiring critics to first read everything

this and taking a preliminary credit for knowing all my 44 volumes! It is unlikely that anyone would spend his life on "refuting me"! No! It is the philosopher himself who is obliged to present his brief conclusions for general viewing! How Martin Luther nailed his 95 theses to the door of the Wittenberg church!

The main, topical theses of Solovyov are generally known, I will use the summation of the ideas of the hystero-philosopher by Konstantin Leontiev, who is very benevolent towards him, in the article "Vladimir Solovyov vs. Danilevsky":

"Russia does not and should not have any special cultural vocation. The purpose of Russian (and generally Slavic) civilization is one: to serve as a ground for reconciliation of Orthodoxy with the papacy. under the leadership of the Pope. "Fall before him (before the pope), O king

Russia! And stand up like an all-Slavic tsar!" We Easterners still have a lot of faith; but the power of the church is weak. I will take with me everything that we have good: the warmth of faith among the people, which has not yet dried up. I will take it all to Rome and cast it at the feet of the Western High Priest. The East has always given the content, the West - the form ... "

Do you notice today the fulfillment of Solovyov's "prophecies"? This urgent, burning need for the unification of Catholics with the Orthodox, so great that for subordinating our Cyril to their Benedict, it is not a pity to throw Russia into the dust!

For greater accuracy, it would be possible to find out, perhaps, from that Roman side today they acutely feel the need to take the vassal oath of the Orthodox patriarchs? .. Once I read an article by a Catholic journalist about the main problems of Rome today. Such a piercing pain that he sincerely regretted: Brazil is losing more than half a million Catholics a year. Well, this is their stronghold - mulatto beauties with crucifixes, great football players humbly standing in line to the Pope, a hundred-meter Christ over Rio de Janeiro ... You can't imagine another Brazil. And it turns out that Catholicism there is rapidly declining because of these American sects, sprawling under the laws of network marketing. (Similar to the disappearance of the Brazilian equatorial forests.)

And against the backdrop of similar problems in Italy (still a stronghold!), Scandals with pedophile priests, try to imagine their cardinals anxiously and sleeplessly waiting for the "Orthodox schismatics" to come to Rome with their confessions ... To put it mildly: not a very plausible picture.

Take a mental look at the whole abyss of our and today's Catholic problems, and who will appear here as the Great Designer of the Unification of Churches under the rule of the pope, easily paying for this with the existence of Russia Vova Solovyov?!

It's just disgusting, where does this pose of a company commander at a morning divorce come from, confidently distributing tasks to entire nations,

setting tasks for churches and states? I have a version, I will express later.

Was he free to choose an object for his idle thought? Solovyov, a physicist (if this mental connecting rod were allowed to approach the department of physics) would have said: the great mission of Russia is to sacrifice itself for the universal unification of the Corpuscular and Wave theories of light. Electronics engineer V. Solovyov: the historical task of Russia is to sacrifice itself for the universal unification of PAL and SEKAM standards.

I beg your pardon if such a parody of a high topic seems humiliating, but, gentlemen of the Catholics, the real humiliation is to be

the object of concern for people like V. Solovyov.

Here is the next difficulty of fussing with Solovyov. He is not only a "defender" of the Zhelyabov terrorists and Catholics, he is also the largest alleged defender of the Jews. He wrote many letters and the famous "Declaration against anti-Semitism", which thundered abroad.

"In letters to F. Getz, Solovyov denounced the pogroms and assured that his pen was always ready to defend distressed Israel. On his deathbed, he prayed for the Jewish people and read a psalm in Hebrew. Solovyov's death caused deep grief for all Russian Jewry. Prayers were read in synagogues for the repose of the soul of Solovyov, one of the "Righteous Among the Nations"" (Wikipedia).

Well, dear Jews, the deadly prayer for Solovyov is 1900. But if you take a quick look at the whole monstrous "Mystery of the 20th century", how many times have the conditions changed, the places of patrons and persecutors! Remember at least the "main enemy" of the Jews of the 1940s, against whom was the main flow of their attacks? - Britain with its Palestinian Mandate! Or the middle of the 1950s: the USSR and the USA are marching together against ... Britain, France, Israel. And the 1970s? Today?

With persons and parties even more shifters. Live Solovyov in Israel today - 200% that he would "put his pen in defense" of Al-Qaeda. This follows directly from his argument: "If the Jews are our enemies, do with them according to the commandment: love your enemies! If they are not enemies, there is no need to pursue them." Today, in the well-known politically correct choir of those who pass Israel, he would be the lead singer, substituting only Osama in his "formula" ... He would have flooded a dozen volumes, probably not about Sophia, but about Sarah Solovyova, but he would have passed for sure.

And his (supposedly) benefit to the Jews of the twentieth century was by no means proportional to his harm to Russia - much, much less.

V. G. Korolenko in the article "Declaration" recalls V. S. Solovyov: "In October 1890, I received a letter from the late Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov, which said, among other things:

"I am sending you the attached statement of writers and scientists with a request to sign it, I consider it superfluous to expand on how much a signature is necessary. Leaving one of these days for St. Petersburg, I humbly ask you to send the signed application to me there at the following address: the "European" hotel on Mikhailovskaya Street. With perfect respect, ready to serve Vladimir Solovyov "...

For him (Korolenko continues about Solovyov) ... Christianity was the source of absolute morality. From this source he also extracted a formula on the Jewish question, which was remarkable for its extraordinary ease and simplicity. He said: "If the Jews are our enemies,

deal with them according to the commandment: love your enemies. If they are not enemies (he thought they were not), then there is no need to pursue them." Many of Solovyov's dogmatic views are shrouded in thick, sometimes almost impenetrable, metaphysical fogs. But when he descended from these misty heights in order to apply certain basic formulas of Christianity to current life, he was sometimes magnificent in his distinct clarity of thought and in his ability to find a simple and concise formula for it ... "

The noisy chirping had its usual effect. A circular from the main administration followed, and the declaration initiated by Solovyov at that time did not appear in Russia. As a real "sedition" it was printed abroad (simultaneously in Paris and Vienna). For Europeans, of course, the statement by Russian writers of axioms recognized by the cultural world could only be of significance as a curious illustration of Russian censorship. But for us even now there is something instructive in this little episode. Using such heroic efforts to nip Solovyov's attempt in the bud, anti-Semitism of that time, as it were, paid its opponents a certain tribute of fear and respect.

"... Some details of the editorial caused me to make some remarks, but because of the shades, I did not consider it necessary to deviate from the case. V. S. Solovyov obviously saw the same thing... Concerning one amendment made by his own hand (the Germanic origin of Russian anti-Semitism), he informed me that he entered it at the request of some of the signatories, considering this insertion superfluous, but not wishing to drag out the matter with disputes about the editorial office ... "

The following pair of points in Korolenko's memoirs is characteristic:

1) "The noisy chatter had its usual effect" - this is, after all, the secret of effectiveness and all such declarations, actions, scandals. "Prohibition" in Russia is the best advertisement for a foreign publication.

2) Solovyov's declaration ended with the paragraph: "On the basis of all this, we most resolutely condemn the anti-Semitic movement in the press, which came to us from Germany, as immoral in essence and extremely dangerous for the future of Russia."

Solovyov wanted to remove "the Germanic origin of the Russian, but failed, anti-Semitism" , for which, in fact, he apologized to Korolenko. He thought: there is no need to justify Russia with such a reservation, but "he entered it at the request of some signatories", gathering more extras.

However, it would be unfair to evaluate Solovyov's contribution to the discussion of the Jewish question only on the basis of that "Declaration", in essence, the usual "collective letter of protest" - one and a half pages of text plus a Euroscandal. His long article "Jewry and the Christian Question", published in the "Orthodox Review"

(1884), the work is really solid, thoughtful. Extensive quotations from Katkov, Bishop of Kherson and Odessa Nicanor. Solovyov proves that real Russian patriots were by no means anti-Semites. This is shown especially expressively by Solovyov on the example of Katkov, but, alas, according to the laws of scandalous journalism, black PR, the page "Declaration" that came out "in Europe" (Paris and Vienna) completely scored and crossed out good articles - "Jewry and the Christian Question" and "New Testament Israel"

(1885), also of internal Russian circulation.

In the Jewish works of the non-scandalous Solovyov, one can see his remarkable consistency and adherence to principles. Solovyov links the positive solution of the Jewish question, like everything in general, with his beloved "God-manhood", the unification of all branches of Christianity and the Jews in a universal theocratic state:

"Recognizing only such a religious resolution of the "Jewish question", believing in the future union of the house of Israel with Orthodox and Catholic Christianity on a common theocratic soil, I had the opportunity to express this conviction from the pulpit (in 1882, a lecture at the Higher Women's Courses). Now I dare to give a more detailed treatment of this view of Judaism ... "

A small comic digression. Hypothesis: if Solovyov was instructed to give a lecture at his Higher Women's Courses on any other "topical issue": railway accidents, the spread of venereal diseases, abortions, "deceived investors", victims of the frequent bankruptcies of joint-stock companies in that era ... he would have deduced in three or four paragraphs, the solution of those problems to your favorite unification of churches under the authority of the pope?!

Solovyov's formulation is generally fair: "The Jews have always treated us in a Jewish way. We, Christians, on the contrary, have not yet learned to treat Judaism in a Christian way... The main interest in modern Europe is money; Jews are masters of money, naturally, they are gentlemen in modern Europe.

The only thing is: severely blaming the Europeans for the 2000-year-old inability to solve the Jewish question in a Christian way, I would still not forget to single out the guilty Europeans from this list - Russia, which for the first time received "on balance" the Jews with their question for less than 100 years before Solovyov. In my opinion, 2000 and 100 years - the difference is already worthy of some isolation! Plus, Russia received the "Jewish question" aggravated by the terrible and bloody "Polish question" (there was a well-known image, the term: "The Poisoned Kiss of Poland").

What Solovyov forgot - Korolenko in ... noisy chatter, which had the usual effect

In 1772, according to the first partition of Poland, Russia returned part of Belarus and Ukraine with a 100,000-strong Jewish population that had grown up there during the time of the Commonwealth. The total number of Jews in the divided country was 900,000.

Of the well-known Russians in the field of solving the Jewish question, let us recall Derzhavin, who tried to deal with the causes of the famine in Belarus, count the number of Jewish tenants and ... is still reproached for anti-Semitism. But the Polish kings Boleslav, Casimir and Mechislav, who allowed Jews to live in particular in Ukraine, are revered as great humanists. ("Meshko, krul, blessed, just" - these Jewish inscriptions have been preserved.)

The Jewish historian Hessen wrote: "The general balance of life in Poland was obviously favorable for the Jews, the Jewish population in Poland increased significantly ... Jews took a wide 'participation in the agriculture of the landowners, developing leases ... among other things, wine trades.'

The Jewish Encyclopedia: "Serving the interests of the landowners ... the Jews incurred the hatred of the population ... The malice of the peasant ... was directed both at the Catholic pan and the Jewish tenant ... and when the Cossack uprising broke out under the leadership of Khmel'nitsky, the Jews, on an equal footing with the Poles, fell victim.

Here's the thing: the Polish pan invited the Jew to the newly captured Ukraine-Belarus only as a tool! Performing the same dirty and dangerous function. And the "key on the topic" here will not be the privileges of Casimir the Just, not the letters of the king Leshka Bely, but the propination and rent of churches.

It must be admitted that representatives of any other nationalities who occupied a place in this "division of labor" behaved in much the same way. Proof, as the classics would say, of "social determinism": whoever seizes a certain territory needs an agent

for its operation. Here is a prime example. In 1495, the Grand Duke of Lithuania Alexander Jagiellon ordered: "knock the Jew out of the land." But a few years later, elected to the Polish throne, he immediately allowed the Jews to return to the same Lithuania. That is, as a Polish "official" he saw the need for a cohort of mobile financial agents in the East.

But it was precisely the precariousness of Polish power over Ukraine that ruined the Jews most of all. Hence the frequent uprisings, and not only the above-cited Jewish Encyclopedia knows what they threatened the tenants with ...

And the Jews themselves? They came and announced to King Casimir:

- We have been wandering here for two thousand years, dreaming, looking for just such a dirty, vile and dangerous job as holding taverns, soldering in debt and confiscating the means of survival from peasants - cows, horses, equipment! Like ripping off the payment for the christening of a child, for the funeral of a parent?

Those in italics are by no means a statement. This is a hypothetical, "pointing" question.

Rule, Britannia, the seas... of lies!

Indeed, why did the Jews so massively go to rent taverns and churches from the Poles, charge Ukrainians money for drinking, baptism, weddings, funerals? ..

But because they, the Jews, simply had no other choice.

For example, the British "culturally" expelled everyone - absolutely everyone! - Jews in 1290, and let them back in after ... 355 years. By the way, it turns out that in England, too, it means that there was a Pale of Settlement - only they had it coinciding with the coastline of the British Isles! (That is, Jews either overseas or at sea.) After that, in order to criticize the Russian Pale of Settlement, it was necessary to stock up on a measure of just the famous British hypocrisy. But today it is possible with every right to return to the British some of the rights and priorities they deserved. For example, it turns out that on every well-known Hitler tablet "Judenfrei" ("Free from Jews"), you can put an icon in the corner - B in a circle. The copyright for this slogan belongs to the British: here is a 645-year-old priority over the Fuhrer, and the fact of walking, action - 355 years against 8!

That same British Pale of Settlement, coinciding with the coastline of the British Isles, and those very holocausts - the burning of ghettos with their inhabitants in Western Europe caused a new Exodus of Jews.

The German emperor was considered the legal successor of the ancient Roman emperor Titus, who, after the destruction of Jerusalem, allegedly

acquired Jews as personal property (Kattego®). On this basis, the emperor owned all the Jews who lived in the territory of the former Roman Empire, as imperial serfs (Katteggpesche), whom he gave, sold or pawned.

But that was at least some kind of protection, the Jews dreamed of the status of Katteg-KpesSche! - against the background of total extermination (for example, in Silesia in 1453).

And it's not "counter-propaganda"...

... not a parry in the spirit of the well-known: "You don't have sausage! "But you have blacks lynched!" The English "final solution" and other facts above are given precisely to clarify: where did this problem come from in Rus'.

There is no direct connection here. It was those people, those surviving remnants of the English, German, French ethnic cleansing that reached, reached Ukraine-Belarus! And they agreed to the only job offered by the Poles.

And what other fact proves, illustrates even the very existence of the Absorption Administration in Israel today? The fact that the flow, the wave of immigration is a huge and completely separate problem. So many thousands of Jews who lived in Europe for centuries is one thing, but so many newcomers who have become a camp near the border is quite another. Here even the Poles are not so guilty as ...

One of the optional tasks of this book is to resolve the issue of "Russian-Ukrainian anti-Semitism." The expectation that someone with more information and more means of disseminating it widely will say or publish something like...

- Yes, yes. There were pogroms in Ukraine. The work there was already very risky: renting churches is not for you to grow carrots! But there was no other work. But in England - Germany, before the purges, we didn't rent the local churches, churches - that's what is characteristic and insulting! And the Jews who came to Russia NOT as tenants immediately had quite cultural conditions. Won Shafirovs became barons 130 years before the Rothschilds!

The medieval Exodus of the Jews to Eastern Europe is a fact long and absolutely established, but rarely mentioned. And in the following, "pogrom-pogrom" context - not mentioned, unfortunately, at all. Today, as is well known, political correctness has reached the point of apologizing for the Crusades, but these events, which happened much later (300-400 years later!), Politically correct Europe has not yet touched this knot tied around Russia's neck!

So, England: 355 years of respectable silence... and certainly not a single anti-Semitic incident! And the Poles during this time ran away from the Ukrainian uprisings 15 times and returned. And they ran away again, leaving their agents to be torn to pieces, thereby creating a reputation for Ukrainians as violent anti-Semites...

In general, this is a big, separate topic I considered earlier, in the book "10 Myths about Ukraine"

island for 300 years), and Jews invited by the Poles to the freshly seized Ukrainian lands to organize their exploitation (tenancy).

Yes, in Russia there was a Pale of Settlement, but after all, Russian peasants, in a sense, had their own Pale of Settlement, which passed along ... the outskirts of their villages. This is me about serfdom, which had just been abolished by that time. Just as slowly, clumsily, Russia solved (this was recognized) and would have solved the issue of "Jewish serfdom."

Russia was the first in the world to start giving Jews land in the best places in the south of the country (the mission of Prince Alexander Golitsyn), from where the "landlords Bronstein", Trotsky's parents, came from. This topic is well considered in the works of the modern historian Dmitry Feldman. Early 20th century: the best lands, voluntary free relocation, "elevating" ones. But even in those blessed generous lands, the Jewish peasants were not attached, they had nothing but the need to return the lifting. It is clear that the Russian serfs at that time could not even dream of such fabulous conditions. In general, it was not anti-Semitism, but rather bureaucracy with all its pluses and minuses...

And (check!) The Shafirovs did become barons in Russia, 130 years earlier than the Rothschilds ...

But in the end, Solovyov forgets all the objective Russian advantages in the "Jewish cause", being carried away by the common all-Christian 2000-year-old guilt, by his ... "instant" repentance. And the Russian cons: the Pale of Settlement, pogrom articles, exactly the opposite - sticks out with his "Declaration". Such, it turns out, maybe unwittingly, a two-way move.

And that American Jewish bankers considered Russia the main enemy of Jewry (and consequently took certain well-known measures) is:

1) their big mistake (see Germany, Hitler, and the whole history of the twentieth century);

2) the personal merit of V. Solovyov, one of the most significant, real consequences of his lectures, letters, declarations.

Apostle of female students

The mental crisis of the Silver Age is visible not only in these nightingale trills, the hysterical readiness to carry the "philosopher" from the pulpit in his arms after Zasluch and her lawyer. Although this, of course, is a symptom. Yes, you just try, substitute mentally on that place, on the raised sweaty palms of the centipede crowd, any other "colleagues-philosophers", for example, Pascal, Hegel, the hermit Diogenes, Nietzsche ... Or imagine Schopenhauer carried on your hands ... - brain rupture! Now, it seems, both Zhanna Friske and Boris

After concerts, Moiseev is not carried away from the stage in his arms ...

And how colorful Immanuel Kant would be in this role, especially if the "fans of philosophy" were so kind as to carry him face up, and he could, fixing his gaze, continue to observe ... "the stars in the sky and the moral law inside".

The social crisis manifested itself in the symmetrical vulgarity of the "philosopher" and the audience. And if anyone thinks that Solovyov on the podium was serious, like Hegel - it's just that for some reason the audience suddenly behaved like at a "Tender May" concert, then here is an eyewitness account (and crossing out another "suddenly" in Russian history) :

"He (Soloviev) appeared with his dissertation and his public readings as a talented, impressionable person, of course, scientifically trained. While defending his dissertation in St. Petersburg, he was completely imbued with spiritualism, he raved or believed in visions and spoke with inflamed eyes about the "miracles" of spiritualists that he had seen in London. By his very nature he was opposed to "crude materialism" and "narrow positivism." In his readings, one could see not so much a philosopher and scientist as a lyricist, who acted mainly on the impressionability of women. It is the lyrics that are constantly visible in his argumentation, not particularly deep, but always tense. He was good only where he was himself, with his impressionability and naivety, for example, in his humorous poems. The scientist's mask only harmed him. Under this mask, he did not feel very comfortable, it weighed him down and tied up his talent. (Article "Two prophets", New time, 1888.)

And the main apologist, Berdyaev, in the article "The main idea of VI. Solovyov" echoes:

"Everyone more or less admits that VI. Solovyov was the greatest Russian thinker. But in the modern generation there is no gratitude for his spiritual feat, there is no understanding and reverence for his spiritual image. Yes, and it must be admitted that the image of VI. Solovyov remains enigmatic. He did not so much reveal himself in his philosophy, theology and journalism as he covered up the contradictions of his spirit. There is VI. Solovyov day and night. And Solovyov's contradictions

night pouring on appearance were reconciled in the mind of Solovyov daytime. About VI. Solovyov, one can justifiably say that he was a mystic and a rationalist, an Orthodox and a Catholic, a church man and a free gnostic, a conservative and a liberal. Prophecy is an intimate theme of the whole spiritual life of VI. Solovyov. He felt himself called to free prophecy. He is alone and not understood, because he carries out a prophetic ministry..."

Look at this blot of decadence that has spread over Russian history! Insane demands for power, the patronage of terrorists, a boisterous retelling from the pulpit of the content of their spiritualistic

sessions, a stream of incoherent lyrics, and all this is taken out of the brackets of possible criticism: "Free prophecy", "Intimate topic". Clearly, here "intimate" means: a deeply personal, lyrical moment, to the detriment of the analytical, objective. But for the hundredth time when you encounter this term in Solovyovian, you involuntarily recall the announcement: "Do not offer intimacy!"

Stunning irresponsibility even turns into oblivion of the foundations of Sacred History, which Solovyov and Berdyaev probably knew better than all of us. Theologians of all directions of Christianity have long recorded: in their time there were Patriarchs, then Judges (Shofetim), then Prophets, there were Apostles. And that's all... The Bible is finished - it's not an almanac, not a monthly "Bulletin of Europe"! And closed - mention after the formation of the Canon, even the Fathers of the Church, not to subsequent philosophers ... no longer "propped up" their books, systems, teachings with the label: "Caution. Free Prophecies. Treat with respect."

No, Berdyaev does not directly demand that Solovyov be equated with the prophet Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah... but he demands the same degree of irresponsibility (Prophets are responsible only before God) for intimate free prophecy.

And why, then, this childless, familyless, eternal bean, a hanger-on among the Trubetskoy and in the family of the poet Alexei Konstantinovich Tolstoy, should not also be included in the Patriarchs? ("Like Abraham, Jacob with offspring - "like the sand of the sea").

No! A much more accurate witness is the correspondent of Novoye Vremya:

"Not particularly deep lyrics, acting mainly on the susceptibility of women." In general ... hysteria, as it was said.

By the way, the main platform for Solovyov's speeches, as you know, was the St. Petersburg Higher Women's Courses. The main crowds of "philosophy lovers" collected Solovyov's lectures (with free access) from the department of the Higher Women's Courses. That is, a considerable part of his guilt is also in the appearance of this well-known social phenomenon of the second half of the twentieth century: "Cursist". Twisted, radical,

under the very hat stuffed with primitive quotes, a potential "goer to the people" and a terrorist.

If it seems to someone that the author's personal dislike for Solovyov deprives the overall picture of objectivity, for example, in this assessment of his students, "coursers", I can offer a couple more assessments of this phenomenon. True, under a slightly different name. The fact is that 5-7 Women's Courses were opened in Russia. But the main ones, of course, were: the St.

Bestuzhev-Ryumin. It was on them that Solovyov labored. As a result, "bestuzhevka" in the verbal turnover pushed out the "courser" and even entered the explanatory dictionary of the early twentieth century, where two meanings are indicated. "Bestuzhevka": 1) a student of courses opened by Bestuzhev; 2) an idealist.

In the novel "Disintegration" by the famous everyday writer of the era, Pyotr Boborykin, there are lines: "For all of them, I am a "naughty" idealist. In one word - "bestuzhevka!" They have something like a holy fool ... "

So, the synonymous use of the words "student student" and "stuzhevka" is quite correct. The first one I liked purely phonetically: "the apostle of female students" sounds somehow better.

And it's not just me, trying on these pages to define

VI. Solovyov as a serious and "bad" disease of the Russian spirit, I operate mainly with his brief theses ... And, for example, they will object to me that a complete detailed analysis of his books, the entire "Solovievskaya" would give theurgy a closer acquaintance ardent with "Sofya Solovyova", absolutely a different interpretation. But here is an admirer, an employee, one might say, "Soloviev's drive belt", a very influential journalist, public figure V. Korolenko summarized in the story with their "Declaration":

"Many of Solovyov's dogmatic views are shrouded in thick, sometimes almost impenetrable, metaphysical fogs. But when he descended from these misty heights in order to apply one or another of the basic formulas of Christianity to current life, he was sometimes magnificent in terms of the distinct clarity of thought and the ability to find a simple and concise formula for it ... "

And if we talk only about formulas, about final conclusions, then what an amazing aberration of the 20th century is revealed here! After all, all the "magnificence of Solovyov's formulas" that amazed contemporaries lies in a simple confusion, transfer of the gospel commandments addressed to an individual - "Love your enemies", "Thou shalt not kill" - to the state, government, politics, state church. In the name of the "God-mankind" proclaimed by him, the worldwide unification of people, Christians and Jews for life according to the gospel laws, one can simply forget about the modern laws of the Russian Empire! With his demand for power in 1881, he shows precisely

such an interpretation of his ideas that cancels Russian statehood, and the crowd picks up on him and his idea.

A primitive trick designed to forget a simple fact. Christianity, 1600 years before Solovyov, became the state religion and not only justified, but also blessed the armies and monarchs who went to war and executed their subjects. And Orthodox, and Catholic, and Protestant states, with the approval of their priesthood, continued for all 1600 years ... - yes, they just continued

remain states, which presupposes the existence of a court and an army. But here, we repeat, the "magnificent Soloviev formula" appears, his ultimatum to Alexander III: "The tsar must forgive (the regicides). If he is a Christian, he must forgive. If he is the real leader of the people, he must forgive. If state power embarks on a bloody path, we will renounce it."

The total triumph of the formula: Zhelyabov + Solovyov = public opinion ... can be revealed even in such a comparison of facts. As you know, in March 1881, Tsar Alexander III answered the Solovyov ultimatum: "I would have mercy if they attempted on me, but I can't pardon my father's killers." However, it is also well known (but it has not yet been compared from this point of view) that a few years later the next group of terrorists, with Alexander Ulyanov, who had already attempted on him personally, was still not pardoned by the tsar. There can be no talk of some kind of double-mindedness of Tsar Alexander III. He really is the rock on which Russia rested. The solidity, noble integrity and straightforwardness of the character of the king were recognized by the whole world, including his opponents. And what he said in March 1881 is a reflection of that tremendous social pressure, the total dominance of social thought formulated by Solovyov. So even the great king himself also believed then that terrorists could be forgiven if ...

Do you understand? He, Alexander, only a couple of weeks after taking power (and a huge responsibility), has not yet fully formed a system of views, decisions, which made him a stronghold of Russia. And to some extent, he himself is still subject to the influence of wretched chatter, he cannot yet turn off this background, off-screen itching. How! "The whole society is talking", "Soloviev formulates, threatens to renounce bloody power", and the father of that Solovyov previously taught the future tsar the subject "Russian history" ... And through all this unprecedented pressure: terrorist attacks, father in a coffin, the greatest responsibility, falling down in an instant on his head, and this "voice of the public", which still needs to be learned to distinguish from the "voice of the people", the tsar takes his first step ...

It would be possible to pay much less attention to the hysterical "philosopher", but Solovyov's tendency of an ahistorical, non-realistic attitude towards the state, and indeed towards the surrounding reality, constantly emerges even today.

Here I can share my personal experience. The current, early XX! century, students, or rather, the most sincere of them, who are interested, often approach their history teacher with questions (and even with their off-screen ready-made answers). It can be said: they do not ask, but check. The most typical "question", the topic of a mini-dispute: our Orthodox Church preaches "Thou shalt not kill", but she herself sprinkles nuclear submarines, bombers and tanks with holy water!

And there is always a ready-made antithesis to this "duplicity" - I have already learned to guess it from a half-word, half-syllable. "Here is the Dalai Lama, he has the most unfeigned, real "Thou shalt not kill"!" Sometimes

other preachers, spiritual leaders are also called, but the Dalai Lama, an impeccable, world-famous person, is indeed the most "powerful" card in the deck. They come from it, in 95% of cases.

You have to start from afar. Yes, of course, today the followers of the Dalai Lama in London, Paris, New York, Moscow are meek, gentle people, a true example of humanism in word and deed. And Hare Krishnas can also live in London, Moscow, literally every day setting an example of meekness, non-violence, total vegetarianism, etc.

But after all, there was a period when the Dalai Lamas were responsible for the entire responsibility of the state church, and they had the opportunity to bless and admonish the Tibetan army. Which, for example, under King Songtsen Gampo and his successors, practically conquered half of China. One day, a 200,000-strong Tibetan army reached the Chinese capital, forcing the emperor to flee. Under King Tisong Detsen, Buddhists had to fight another Tibetan religion, Bon, whose adherents, led by the Bon minister Mashanga, were somehow walled up alive in a cave. And the Buddhist monk Lhalun Pelgi Dorje killed the king of Landarmu, a supporter of Bon, with an accurate bow shot, as it is said in Buddhist chronicles, "filled with compassion for the (misguided) king." And the day of the assassination of the persecutor king became a Tibetan Buddhist holiday.

And there was a well-known discussion in the Tibetan monastery of Samye (792-794) between supporters of the Indian and Chinese versions of Buddhism on the issue, by the way, of methods of spiritual improvement and achieving the state of enlightenment. And those who won this dispute also had a chance to execute those who misinterpreted nirvana...

And the current Dalai Lama of the 10th century is indeed an example of genuine humanism of the 20th-20th] centuries, perhaps the most worthy of the Nobel Peace Prize winners ... - the Dalai Lamas of that period cannot renounce, for example, like Khrushchev from Stalin, for that simple and absolutely wonderful reason that He - and there is They in a new incarnation! This is the same fundamental dogma of Buddhists as the existence of Heaven, Hell, Purgatory among Catholics.

And each Dalai Lama is always a reincarnation of the previous one, which I would express by the formula: Dalai Lama (M) = VetsogpDalai Lama (M-1).

And the main thing in these disputes with today's inquisitive students - believe me! - by no means pulling out the above facts, but in presenting them and by no means in the tone of a malevolent counter-propagandist. And all my modest successes in those post-lecture debates I attribute only to my sincere respect for the current Dalai Lama, the most worthy of politicians and religious figures of our time.

Somehow, I remember, on Rozhdestvenka Street I met a kind of

"Buddhist patrol", four pleasant young men who handed me a sheet with a column of signatures: a demand to allow the Dalai Lama to enter Kalmykia. Most likely it was self-employment. I then signed, and now, during these disputes, when my students enter from the "map" "But the Dalai Lama ...", I in response lay out the history of Tibet to them and most of all I wish that "Buddhist patrol" would approach the institute corridor, collecting signatures in favor of the arrival of the Dalai Lama, for example, now in Buryatia. And then, under the searching eyes of my young debaters, I would demonstrate the entire "correct" sequence of actions: I would slowly take the sheet, read it carefully, look into the eyes of our lamaists and ... cross myself, sign ...

And how many deeds Hindus have had to accomplish over the millennia of their existence as a state religion, absolutely opposite to the current distributors of free rice in European capitals!

Compassionate understanding - that, in my opinion, is the correct view of the history of religion, which happened to bear the burden of the state!

Of course, it is a sin to demand this from Solovyov himself, but at least one of the philosopher's hand-bearers would try to just think. Together with the tsar, the Zhelyabovtsy that day wounded several dozen and killed three people: the Cossack of the royal convoy Maleichev, a random passer-by Evdokia Davydova (two children became orphans) and a 14-year-old boy Nikolai Zakharov. Hundreds more have been killed in previous attempts. Their relative failure was only the explosion of the royal train: then in general - a nightmare! - not a single person died. (They didn't allow more such failures.)

And if Tsar Alexander would have forgiven the Zhelyabovtsy, then what should be done with their neighbors in Petropavlovka? There is a killer over there, who killed only one watchman and stole 15 rubles. And there - poisoned out of love and jealousy. In justice they bear the lesser sin. Do not forgive them - here the super-Christian liberals of the Solovyovites should also be indignant.

(Although something tells me that they would not have noticed the hangings of "these": the PR gain on criminals is not the same. Remember the above "Theorem of Apollinaria Suslova" about getting into a host of geniuses and celebrities?)

But, let's say, Solovyov would be honest, principled - he would also remember the murderers-criminals. And if Zhelyabov-Perovskaya was simply forgiven, then we must also apologize to these ... Further: thieves, smugglers, counterfeiters, on whom there is no blood - in the same measure of justice, in proportion, they must be forgiven, apologized to them and released with a day off allowance...

'That is, the buffoon parrot deprives the country of the law enforcement system.

Further: "Enemies must be loved," that is, Russia and the army should not have.

And in what historical, military-political situation did this distortion take place, the substitution of personal commandments and the foundations of state life? Colonial wars around the world, the suppression of the Sepoy Rebellion, long-range preparations for the World War. The real monster of militarism, the future Kaiser Wilhelm II, has already reached the rank of colonel and is ready to ascend the throne. This is the everyday life of the heads of Christian states. But the Pope, to whom Solovyov intends to hand over a herd of Orthodox during the days of the Russian-Turkish war, the war to save Balkan Christians from the massacre, as already mentioned, speaks in Rome calling for a new all-European war against Russia - "Crimean War-2".

Somehow, one of Solovyov's admirers, a certain N. Kortelev, found and published a questionnaire filled out by a "philosopher", where he names Hoffmann and Pope Leo KhSh among his favorite foreign prose writers (Our Heritage magazine No. 55, 2000), - this publication is typical for Solovyov's followers and will be touched on in the future. Kotrelev explains this amazing rating in this way: "He (Soloviev) had great hopes for Leo XIII, the Pope,

famous for its Latin style..."

Well, the chosen historical plot cannot fail to close itself up, showing that it is not at all accidental that this particular one was taken for close consideration from a host of hysterical personalities!

So, the soldiers of the Life Guards of the Finnish Regiment are all veterans of the just ended Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878! Those who saved Christians from bashi-bazooks (and their shepherd, Pope Leo XP) are carrying out a new service: the protection of royal residences. Explosion of the Winter Palace: organizer - Zhelyabov, performer - Stepan Khalturin. Of the heroes who survived the recent war, 56 people were wounded, 11 died:

sergeant major Kirill Dmitriev,

non-commissioned officer Efim
Belonin, bugler Ivan Antonov,
corporal Tikhon Feoktistov, corporal
Boris Leletsky, private Fedor
Solovyov, private Vladimir
Shukshin, private Danila Senin,
private Ardalion Zakharov,
private Grigory Zhuravlev, private
Semyon Koshelev.

Despite the severe frost and the danger of a new assassination attempt, the Sovereign was at the funeral ceremony for heroes at the Smolensk cemetery on February 7, 1880, a year before ...

And the "Russian Catholic" and spiritualist Solovyov completes the picture of the life of those soldiers and Cossacks (victims of other attempts) with a general amnesty for their murderers ...

As I suspect, it is just as difficult for a normal person to perceive these facts of the "Soloviev file" in a significant volume, "in one gulp", as it is for me to pull them out now. Harmful production. I want to stop for a moment, breathe in a different atmosphere, before continuing.

Something completely different

It is important to show a completely different, but equally socially significant attitude towards the events of the Russian turning point. At the same time, choosing not a notorious opponent of Solovyov like Konstantin Pobedonostsev, but such a person as, for example, Helena Blavatsky. Native, by the way, the aunt of Sergei Yulievich Witte, the hero of the next few chapters of this book.

The founder of the Theosophical Society, long gone from Russia, whose vast predominantly Anglo-American flock is hostile to Russia, to the idea of autocracy, Blavatsky issues the spring 1881 issue of her Theosophist magazine in a mourning cover. The murder of Alexander II shocked her so much that she fell ill. Here is the response of the Russian soul:

"God! What is this horror? Doomsday, or what, you have? .. Or Satan moved into the fiends of our Russian land?! Or gone mad

unfortunate Russian people?.. What will happen now? What are we waiting for?! Oh my God! I am an atheist, in your opinion, a Buddhist, a renegade, a republican citizen, but I am bitter! Bitterly! I pity the martyr tsar, the royal family, I pity all Orthodox Rus'! .. I abhor, despise, curse these vile monsters - socialists! "Let everyone laugh at me, but I, [now] an American citizen, feel such pity, such melancholy and shame for the undeserved martyrdom of the autocratic tsar that people in the very heart of Russia cannot feel them more strongly ..."

Having recovered from grief and illness, she wrote an article about Tsar Alexander P. The international fame of Blavatsky contributed to the fact that many newspapers of the world reprinted it.

From a letter from Elena Petrovna to her sister:

"I gave everything I could remember there, and imagine, they didn't throw out a single word and some other newspapers reprinted it. But still, the first time I was in grief, many people asked me, "What does this mean? Are you not an American?" I got so angry that I sent something like a rebuke to the Bombay Gazette: "Don't

as a Russian subject, I put on mourning, - I wrote to them, - but how Russian by birth! As a unit of a multi-million people, blessed by that meek and merciful person, for whom my whole homeland is in mourning. With this I want to express love, respect and sincere grief at the death of the Tsar of my father and mother, my sisters and brothers in Russia! .. "This rebuke of mine silenced them ... Now they know the reason and can go to the devil ..."

She was sent a portrait of the king in a coffin. "As I looked at him," she writes to her aunt N. A. Fadeeva, "believe it or not, I must have lost my mind. An irresistible something quivered in me, and it pushed my hand and myself: as soon as I cross myself with a large Russian Orthodox cross, as I lay down on his hand, the deceased, I was even dumbfounded ... It was me - I remembered the old days, I became sentimental. I didn't expect..."

Next, it is necessary to quote the excellent work of Alexander Vladimirov "Russian Blavatsky" ("Day of Literature", April 2011).

"The scale of her activity, free-thinking, passion in defending ideals, absolute freedom from acquisition and material interests, selfless love for people without distinctions of faith and race expressed the essence of the all-encompassing Russian heart.

All the properties of her character were distinguished by determination and would be more suitable for a man than a woman. She never recognized authorities, walked independently, despising the conditions of the world. So, dressed in men's clothes, on November 3, 1867, she, as a volunteer, took part in the battle of Mentana on the side of the Garibaldians, wishing, together with Garibaldi, to free Rome from power.

papa In this battle, Blavatsky's left arm was twice killed by saber blows, in addition, she received two heavy bullet wounds in her right shoulder and leg, as well as a blow with a stylet to the very heart, leaving a noticeable scar. She was bleeding from five wounds when they pulled her out of the ditch, presuming she had already died...

Having spent most of her life abroad, among foreigners, Blavatsky did not dissolve her uniqueness in other people's ideas and traditions, but remained invariably Russian both in character and in the direction of all her work. In establishing the Theosophical Society in London, in which the English aristocracy played a leading role, and which was notable for its well-known rejection of Russia, Blavatsky constantly declared: "Yes, I am Russian." She launched a wide activity in the English colony - India. And this is despite the acute geopolitical rivalry between Britain and Russia in Asia and the East. While in India, she could almost publicly, in society, say half in jest that it would be good if General Yermolov with his regiments invaded India and liberated the Indians from the colonial oppression of Britain. To her English friend, Sinnett, for example, when she was already 55 years old ... with deliberately peasant rudeness, she continued to write about the eternal dispute between the West and Russia over the Balkans:

"My dear Mr. Sinnett, I am serious with you, because you are not one of those psychopaths who always mistake me for a Russian spy. You are as blind in your devotion and admiration for your [English] Conservative politics as a husband is to his beloved wife. You don't see her shortcomings, but the Teachers see... And if you continue in the same vein as he (I mean your old idiot Salisbury) and shut up Bulgaria in Russia's nose, then I assure you, she (Russia) will plant a pig for you in India and through Afghanistan. I know from the Teachers what is unknown to you...

Ah, dear master of my heart! If it were not for the [Theosophical] Society and the Masters to whom I daily sacrifice my blood and honor, if it were not for those few English like you whom I have learned to love as my own flesh and blood (metaphorically, for my flesh and blood I hate) - if not for all this, with what colossal force I would hate you, the English! Indeed, the behavior and policies of your present cabinet are dishonorable, despicable, worthy of Judas, and at the same time delightfully stupid! Only Churchill behaves like a reasonable person and surprises me. I see that he is not stupid at all and he has a good instinct. The fact that he left your Salisbury to its fate may have saved England from a surprise Russian raid on you, and with allies, my dear - such allies that your diplomats never even thought of - and not even with your filthy Turkey".

When Russia entered the war with Turkey, Blavatsky wrote to American newspapers... publicly speaking not only against the Turks, but also against such serious spiritual and world opponents of Russia as the Jesuits. She makes a magnificent translation into English of Turgenev's poem "Windsor Croquet", and it is published

in several newspapers at once. She is haunted by the New York Poles with their anti-Russian antics...

Even in the pages of her monumental works, written for English-speaking readers, Blavatsky continues to defend Russia. In *Isis Unveiled* she writes:

"Faithful to its policy of being anything and for anyone, if only for the benefit of its own interests, the Church of Rome, while we are writing these lines (1876), looks favorably on the atrocities in Bulgaria and Serbia and is probably maneuvering with Turkey against Russia ... The Vatican is happy to seize on any alliance that promises, if not the restoration of its power, then at least the weakening of its adversary (Russia).

She was in constant anxiety about the outcome of the war, for her uncle, cousin and nephew who fought. Elena Petrovna was unspeakably pleased with the victories of Russian weapons, which she closely followed. She continued for a long time, as during the entire war, to send money for the Russian wounded, and even the first proceeds received from *Isis* went to the same goal. Everything she received

At that time, for articles in Russian newspapers, everything went entirely to the Red Cross and to the barracks of the Caucasian wounded.

A revolutionary in her spiritual aspirations and in her orientation towards the sacred East, she paradoxically was close to protective positions, in some way echoing the views of Konstantin Leontiev. Supporting the right of the people to revolt in the event of their foreign oppression, as in India, she looked in a completely different way at the nihilists and Narodnaya Volya who raised their heads with their terror and violence (*italics mine*. - I. Sh.), which she organically could not stand.

Blavatsky devoted an interesting article to Turgenev's novel "Fathers and Sons", in which she prophetically asserted that the image of the destroyer Bazarov created by the writer's power of thought is capable of bringing innumerable disasters to Russia in the future. She collaborated as an author with the famous Russian publicist Katkov ... Blavatsky's books "From the Caves and wilds of Hindustan", "On the blue mountains. Tribes of the mountains" could be found in the personal libraries of Leo Tolstoy and even Lenin (!), Vladimir Solovyov (more critically) and Nikolai Leskov (very positively) referred to it.

Perceiving the tsar as the anointed of God, Blavatsky did not accept republican forms of government and saw in the very figure of the autocrat the personal embodiment of the Divine Will.

One of Blavatsky's biographers, Mrs. Johnston, reports: "Despite the lack of courtesy on the part of Russian newspapers towards

E.P.B., she always subscribed to many Russian magazines and newspapers and, not being able to read them in a day, took time off from her five-six-hour night's rest, wanting to know what was happening in her native country. As much as she could, from the pages of theosophical journals,

having influence on the Western intelligentsia, she defended Russia from slander and slander. The Russian spirit, Russian truth, Russian justice, in a big word - Orthodoxy, so vividly reflected by the great Russian culture, embodied and embody the idea of the world Universe. Our compatriot Helena Petrovna Blavatsky gave her life on the altar of serving this Ideal. And who can say where a great service is performed for Russia: within its borders and in battles with internal enemies, or outside its borders, with external enemies?

Unfortunately, in Russia, in Blavatsky's homeland, slander about her anti-Orthodoxy has been spreading and is spreading. But it must be emphasized that in all her writings, most of which are written in English, the critique of the "church" meant precisely the Western Church, the dominance and Jesuitism of the papists. Blavatsky never criticized the sincere, Orthodox faith in Christ.

The incorrect information that was printed about her then in Russia was strongly

grieved Blavatsky:

"Well, why are they all lying?.. Where did they get the idea that I am going to abolish Christianity and preach Buddhism? If people in Russia read what we write, they would know that we are preaching a pure Christ-like theosophy - the knowledge of God and morality of life, as Christ himself understood it ... Well, if the reporters talk nonsense to them, they would have the courage to print objections. It seems that I wrote the most inoffensive, most good-natured letter, but M and him did not have enough conscientiousness to put it? .. Well, God be with them, dear compatriots! .. "

Blavatsky was sometimes accused of Freemasonry. But she did not enter into any Freemasonry, unless one ranks among them the greatest spiritual teachers of India - the Himalayan Mahatmas ...

Therefore, when for her two-volume Isis Unveiled she received a message from an unknown Masonic society, which said that she was accepted into it in gratitude for deep research, this fact, according to contemporaries, caused her an attack of uncontrollable laughter.

Blavatsky possessed special, as they are called today, "paranormal" abilities, for which some were burned in other centuries, while others were elevated to the rank of prophets and saints. Zhelikhovskaya, sister of Blavatsky, describes the Orthodox blessing given to young Elena Petrovna by one of the future hierarchs of the Orthodox Church, who learned about her abilities:

"On the way, it was in Zadonsk, at mass, that Bishop Isidore, the former Exarch of Georgia, who later became the Metropolitan of Kiev, and then Novgorod, St. Petersburg and Finland ... He knew her back in Tiflis and sent a servant to call her to him . His Grace asked her affectionately where and how she

she wandered, where she was going, etc. Noticing the phenomena surrounding her, Vladyka drew attention to them. He asked questions with great interest, asked questions mentally and, having received sensible answers to them, was even more amazed ...

At parting, he blessed:

"There is no power not from God! You have nothing to be embarrassed by it if you do not abuse the special gift given to you ... Are there many unknown forces in nature? It is not given to a person to know all of them, but it is not forbidden for him to recognize them, just as it is not forbidden to use them. He will overcome and, in time, can use them for the benefit of all mankind... May God bless you for everything good and kind..."

Elena Petrovna quietly departed for a better world in the spring of May 8, 1891.

London at the age of 60 in his office chair. The last lines written by her hand were the lines of an article about Russia ... "

Three reasons prompted such a detailed citation of the work of Alexander Vladimirov.

Firstly, this side of the life of Blavatsky, a Russian patriot and collaborator of Katkov, is little known to some compatriots. And on my part, this is by no means an agitation in favor of Theosophy, not a hint at some kind of reality of all its fantasies - Great Teachers, Mahatmas and other Tibetan passions. But how touchingly she threatens the enemies of Russia with them, which makes the picture even more touching, even poignant!..

Do you understand? A sweet, noble girl threatens the offenders of her country with toy knights drawn by heroes, sand cakes molded by her!

However, this girl won the greatest fame in the West at that time. Its Theosophical Society has 100,000 members. Her articles were reprinted in newspapers around the world for many years, and absolutely regardless of any one-time sensations. It is Vera Zasulich and her lawyer who need to stage a terrorist attack and get freed from the ruins of a Russian court in order to get their one-time portion of advertising, the attention of Western newspapers. Next - the coven! Let's next scandal, shot, bang!

In the book "World War II. Reloading" I have already looked at the resentment of the dissident Volodya Bukovsky at the "Western conformist intellectuals" who have lost their piety towards him (in his essay, the preface to Suvorov-Rezun's book "Icebreaker"). Once, at his scandal, he received such a one-time portion plus a license for five years of lecturer's "chess", and then - alas: "Until the next scandal, dear friend!"

And portions of fame in the West of his namesake Solovyov (grains in comparison with Blavatsky) were also disposable, associated with Russian scandals - either the "Ultimatum to forgive terrorists", or the "Declaration", which was so successfully substituted under the ban of tsarist censorship.

Secondly, speaking of the spiritual, intellectual crisis that struck Russia at the "day of the dynasty", bringing this "bottom" closer, it was worth mentioning the general nature of the crisis of the 19th century. Europe and the USA clung to Blavatsky's Theosophy just as greedily as our decadents seized Sophia Solovyov.

And we also note something important: Helena Blavatsky's pamphlet against Bazarov is an active rejection of "Bazarovism". After all, this Turgenev character, the forerunner of the Narodnaya Volya, as you know, was in the ideological sense a direct projection of the "vulgar materialists" Buchner, Moleschot, whose

he dragged and read books throughout the novel. Blavatsky sincerely hates "vulgar materialism", and this is in all her works. But Solovyov also criticizes the same "vulgar" Buechners, plus the "positivists" Comte and Spencer. The fact is that Blavatsky and Solovyov are already the third round of the 20th century, that twenty years before them Europe, the USA, and Russia were dominated by positivists, "vulgar materialists" - the same "excretions of the body" as sweat, urine... Our mystics were one of the reactions to this. So we need to think also about why it became "crowded within the strict framework of Christian dogmas" for the scientists of the twentieth century? Newton, Pascal, Descartes were just right, but Buchner was cramped.

And thirdly, in my opinion, it is quite acceptable to compare Blavatsky with Solovyov also as some kind of "enterprises", "firms". The results of their "production" are a host of fans, and this indicator is quite suitable for comparison. It also gives a certain general positioning: to delve into the essence of the differences between the Theosophy of Blavatsky and Sophia Solovyova?.. It is enough to count the audience gathered.

And it turns out that ... the success of Solovyov's "firm" is purely local. This is Russian decadence, the Silver Age, the Moscow Religious and Philosophical Society named after VI. Solovyov" (Bely, Bulgakov, Bely, Ivanov, Trubetskoy), these are the highest marks from Berdyaev and - "Solovyov, the only Russian philosopher without exaggeration" - from Daniil Andreev.

It is extremely funny when, typing "Vladimir Solovyov" in an Internet search engine to double-check the details of his life ten times, you first get several pages about his double namesake, a TV journalist.

Helena Blavatsky has a worldwide success. During her lifetime, the membership of the Theosophical Society exceeded 100,000 people, at that time the figure was simply enormous, fantastic. Audience quality? Who would

they didn't count me after that, but I still have to say this: English aristocrats, skeptics, who have asked the price of everything, who have touched everything - from Karl Marx to Oscar Wilde, are a more complex and prestigious audience than an intellectual cattle happily carrying Vera in their arms Zasulich and Solovyova!

And after Blavatsky's death, her Theosophical Society worked powerfully, generating and giving out both Steiner's anthroposophy (which drew on itself many "Solovievists", like A. Bely), and the "project" of Krishnamurti and the "Order of the Star", which thundered in the world just as powerfully.

And the main difference, for which all quotes and comparisons are given: Blavatsky never used the "anti-Russian resource" in achieving her success.

Exactly the opposite, as was shown in the cited work.

Solovyov, on the other hand, grew up on it, like a strain of bacteria on a cup of laboratory broth - from speeches in defense of terrorists (the main success of life) to printed appeals to "foreign audiences".

It was the "mysticism of Sofya Solovyova" that led the generation of her adherents to become hysterical enemies of their state with critical intellectual baggage - the phrase "The worse, the better."

Chapter 6

Returning to our Palestines, to the "bottom" of the Russian dynasty, we must touch upon the moment when Solovyov's decadence becomes a bomb, an anti-state action. Let us start from the well-known fact that in a number of works, and especially in the book "Russia and the Universal Church" (Paris, 1889), "Soloviev propagated the idea of the reunification of the Western and Eastern Churches under the leadership of the Pope, for which he was criticized by Slavophiles and conservatives."

In the previous chapter, I admit, somewhat exaggerating, I used formulations like: "... the vassal oath of the Orthodox Patriarchs ... to the Pope of Rome." And today's admirers of Sofya Solovyova may object that the philosopher did not at all demand any formal humiliation, the destruction of the Orthodox Church, the "vassal oath of the Patriarchs", but meant "something in general ... subordination of the type in the philosophical sense", as in Manilov - to ... drink tea on a high, high balcony, from which Petersburg (in Solovyov's version - Rome) would be visible.

Do you understand what this armchair dreaminess means and how disgusting it is? The son of a famous historian, himself a specialist in the history of churches, in his Manilov dreams suddenly forgets that in

there were (!) and quite real attempts to unite the Churches under the leadership of the Pope of Rome, and it was absolutely authentically recorded, documented how it ended. This is Uni!

In the book "10 Myths about Ukraine" of 2009, in the chapter "Despondency of the Seven Unions", I considered them - from the Union of Lyon (1274), Florence (1439) and to Lublin and Brest, when in

In 1595, the envoys of four Uniate bishops arrived in Rome, expressed their obedience to the pope, accepting all Catholic dogmas, leaving only the rites of the Orthodox Church. Pope Clement VIII joyfully accepted this connection, printed a medal with the inscription KiTep1\$ geserl\$ ("Russians accepted"). Yes, yes, pan-"Ukrainians", that's what everyone was called in Southern and Western Rus', before the "secondary Ukrainization" under the tsars

Alexander and Nicholas the First, which will be discussed in this book.

But in fact, the Russians did NOT accept the union. They rebelled against it for hundreds of years (including the Right-Bank Ukraine, reunited with Russia later), and it is well known how those uprisings ended.

Archbishop of Belarus Georgy Konissky describes one of the massacres as follows:

"This execution was still the first in the world and of its kind, and unheard of in mankind due to its ferocity and treachery, and posterity will hardly believe this event, for no wild and most ferocious Japanese will come up with its invention; and the work into action would frighten the most beasts and monsters.

This spectacle was opened by a Roman procession with a multitude of their priests, who persuaded the Little Russians led to the sacrifice, so that they would accept their law for their deliverance ... But these, without answering them anything, prayed to God according to their faith. The place of execution was filled with people, troops and executioners with their tools. Hetman Ostranitsa, convoy general Surmila and colonels Nedrigailo, Boyun and Rindich were wheeled, and their arms and legs were broken every minute, the veins were pulled from them along the wheel until they died; Chuprina, Okolovich, Sokalsky, Mirovich and Vorozhbit were nailed to boards covered with pitch and burned slowly with fire; foremen: Mentyay, Dunayevsky, Skubrey, Glyansky, Zavezun, Kosyr, Gurtovy, Tumar and Tugay are quartered in parts. The wives and children of these sufferers, seeing the initial execution, filled the air with cries and sobs; soon shut up. To these women, according to the incredible atrocity of that time, cutting off their breasts, cut them down to one, and with their breasts they beat their husbands, who were still alive, on their faces, the children who remained behind their mothers, wandering and crawling around their corpses, burned everyone in the mind of their fathers on iron grates, under which they threw coals and fanned

hats and brooms.

By the way, they repeated several times the ferocity committed in Warsaw against the unfortunate Little Russians, several times they boiled in cauldrons and burned their children on coals in the form of their parents, betraying the fathers themselves to the most cruel executions ... "

There are quite a few similar descriptions (as well as the executions of Ukrainians themselves), including those of Polish authors - the poor fellows simply did not know what to be ashamed of here and zealously covered hundreds of pages! ..

It may be objected that by the 19th century morals softened, and the Solovyov Union would most likely have passed more liberally. True, today's reader should beware of another illusion: that Solovyov's "counterparties", i.e., figures "on the other side" of his union, were extremely tolerant people like the current Popes of the 20th] century - the meek John Paul II or the current pensive scientist Benedict XY].

Of course, the bashi-bazouks of the time of the papacy of Leo KhT (actually the executors of the Solovyov Union project), who simply, without Polish ideas, massacred Bulgarian, Serbian Orthodox priests in 1877 (together with their flock), were somehow more, excuse me, liberal, more humane than the fighters for the union of the 17th century, but ... Sonya Solovyova nevertheless received her portion of the bloody victims of the massacre of the 1870s.

I will supplement my work with theses, brief but completely verified conclusions from the works of Solovyov, with a more detailed study of the recognized specialist Konstantin Leontyev. Of course, I retain Leontiev's benevolent assessments of Solovyov, or the place where Leontiev admits that he is not able to refute him, because the time of writing this article is 1888 ... Then life itself answered.

Leontiev K. N. Vladimir Solovyov vs. Danilevsky.

"There is no dispute, it is so simple, clear and sublime - to take the first step towards reconciliation of the two Churches, divided and warring for a long time, but internally united by a common "grace", as Solovyov argued.

I can, in my personal actions and even in my thoughts about the present, be in complete submission of the spirit to the representatives of the Eastern Hierarchy and at the same time I can say to myself this: "If this is a union of the Churches, in whatever form, even in the form simple obedience to the pope, is in God's plans, then the time will come when our Eastern Bishops will find this possible and correct, and our believing descendants will be obliged to follow them even "to Canossa." And if not, no! And only then will it be decided and clear what Vladimir Solovyov was like in his time, whether he was a great prophet of truth or a false prophet who wanted, in the spiritual field, to rise above the spiritual authorities..."

The broad base of the spiritual-church pyramid is common; its peak should be in Rome, according to Mr. Solovyov. We may not

agree with this last conclusion (Vladimir Solovyov is not a council of Eastern Bishops); we can, or rather, even must now, as Orthodox, think and hope that this peak will deviate more to the east than to the west...

The very self-will and the very originality of his initial explanations bribe in his favor even a mature mind, even a God-fearing heart.

But the possibility of personal salvation, apparently, Solovyov recognizes in the bosom of Eastern Orthodoxy. Why should I go to Rome when no one who has the right to command me spiritually prescribes this to me? Neither the All-Eastern Council, nor the Eastern Patriarchs, nor the Holy Russian Synod

- I haven't been told that yet!

Vladimir Solovyov for me has neither a personal mystical anointing nor the collective power of a spiritual cathedral.

I recognize for him with joy and love the power of the personal spirit, but I do not recognize the spiritual power of grace for him. In this sense, in the sense of obligation, the catechism is the most concise, dry and poorly composed, but simply approved by spiritual censorship, for me, an Orthodox, is a million times more important than all his learning and all his talent!

According to Vlad. Solovyov, Russia does not have and should not have any special cultural vocation. The purpose of Russian (and generally Slavic) civilization is one: to serve as a ground for reconciliation of Orthodoxy with the papacy. The vocation is exclusively religious; everything else is both hopeless and unimportant. Therefore, any attempt to sharply isolate Russia from the West in other respects: in state, economic, scientific, philosophical and aesthetic, is an attempt not only vain, but also directly harmful, as an obstacle and delay on the main path ...

It is therefore in no way desirable for Mr. Solovyov to shake the foundations of our state power. It is, I repeat, almost inconvenient to deal directly with Orthodoxy, in order to submit it to the papacy (although, perhaps, it is slightly desirable).

What to do? It is necessary (everything to clear the same path to the "higher") to shake the more accessible supports; to shake the foundation of cultural hopes proper; it is necessary to debunk Danilevsky and discourage once and for all his students and admirers.

Some of his instructions can be turned against him. For example: about the theories of winged and creeping.

(Next, it is considered how Solovyov, with the help of Plato, beats Danilevsky's "creeping" theory and puts forward his own, Solovyov's, "winged" one. - I. Sh.)

So, we see that Vlad. Serg. Solovyov, the difference between "winged" theories and "creeping" theories is based on two fairly simple features: on the difference in their relationship to the future and on the difference in their relationship to the past and the present. The "winged" theory is therefore the one that is least connected with the past, with history, with the past and the present; "creeping" - is more closely connected by its thoughts with this existing and past, with this that has already been in history or remains in it.

On the relation of these opposite theories to the future, Vladimir Solovyov himself does not speak so directly; but from what he gave

example of the Platonic Republic and the medieval system of Europe, we have the right to conclude that he considers a "non-creeping" thought to be one that has no possibility of being realized earlier than in 1000 years.

Is Vlad. Solovyov is completely divorced from the foundations of modernity given to him? Is he completely free from ideas, blessings, pleasing to the past?

On the contrary, in some respects he is still much more bound by the ready-made data of life than Plato, on the one hand, than Danilevsky and his followers, on the other.

Perhaps this dream is even more "winged" than the ideal state of Plato in its striving for perfection, but very real in its foundations, and than the subordination of a certain existing, modern, already given to us Orthodoxy, also modern, also given and even more, perhaps, worked out and definite papacy ... But this flight of a European scientist is already the flight of Icarus, whose wax on the stuck wings melted, and he drowned in a dark abyss.

Mr. Solovyov is not like that: he is incomparably more practical, he proposes to us a matter that is clear, simple, and apparently feasible. We Easterners need only admit that Patriarchs Photios and Michael Cerularius were less right than the Roman popes of their time, and at the same time humble our national pride, and reconciliation is prepared.

In any case, Solovyov's sermon, at least in general terms, is already quite clear.

Fall before him (before the pope), O Tsar of Russia! And rise like the All-Slavic Tsar!

And for this clarity of purpose, which reaches almost to the point of rudeness, we Russians (in the field of national thought we are by no means spoiled by clarity) should be most grateful to Solovyov ...

In the article (Soloviev), in addition to this general accusation of "groveling" on one's own national grounds, there are four special sections: 1) on the land community; 2) about Russian science; 3) about Russian philosophy and 4) about Russian art.

Solovyov does not count on any of the above. The landed community does not save the agricultural class from pauperism. It existed among many other peoples in the primitive period of their history and therefore does not represent anything special Slavic. Russian science is now in decline. Russian scientists are becoming collectors of material, laborers.

Russians are not disposed towards pure philosophy. They want life. They are more inclined towards mystical philosophy; but even that can no longer flourish on the soil of national mysticism (on the soil of Orthodoxy).

Our art is only a branch of common European art; this is first. And secondly, and it is currently in decline.

Mr. Solovyov considers the time of the prosperity of our literature (inclusive) from "Eugene Onegin" to "Anna Karenina".

There is a lot of sad truth about the present in all this; there is also a lot of unpleasant plausibility in the author's denials in relation to the near future.

But on the other hand, since in the most negative phenomena of life there always lies the germ of something antithetical or positive to them, some of these negative half-truths

Mr. Solovyov can be directly rejoiced, but about others be in favorable doubt and ask yourself: is this so?

V. Solovyov says that "communal landownership in itself, as statistics show, is not at all conducive to the success of agriculture. The community provides each peasant with a piece of land; but it cannot in any way provide him with a harvest or return the productive forces to the depleted soil. "The rural community (says the author) is by no means an exclusive feature of the Russian or Slavic cultural type; it corresponds to one of the primitive stages of socio-economic development through which the most diverse peoples passed. This is not a deposit of a particularly Russian future, but only a remnant of a distant universal past."

<...> Vladimir Sergeevich Solovyov finds that science is currently in decline in Russia. He says about it this way: "Our best scientists (both in the natural sciences and in the humanities) have partly graduated, and partly are finishing their careers. Today there are more scientific workers than before, but there are almost no real masters at all. Thanks to the continuous accumulation of scientific material, our young scientists know more than their predecessors, but they are worse than they are able to use their abundant knowledge. Instead of solid scientific creations, we see only a heap of building material growing in all directions, and the work of a scientist is increasingly turning into the menial work of an artisan."

I do not undertake to object to Mr. Solovyov's this idea directly.

Mr. Solovyov, from another point of view, is perhaps satisfied with the present poverty of our science, but he is satisfied not because he finds toil without creativity generally commendable and does us a special cultural honor. No! If he is glad of this poverty, then only

because he wants to tell all of us between the lines and on this occasion all the same and the same.

- Abandon all hope for originality from this side as well.

- Our vocation is different: a warm faith, a strong state and a humble, selfless concession to Rome!

Since I am not objecting to one of those "laborers" of science whom Mr. Solovyov mentioned and who are always too precise and strict with others, because they have nothing else to do, but I object to myself

Mr. Solovyov, a man with a broad and "winged" thought, then there is no need to exact from me that I understand the word science too broadly, including in this concept, for example, high journalism. After all, the best works of Mr. Solovyov (his "History and Future of the Theocracy", let's say), for all their scholarship, are works only semi-scientific in spirit, but in purpose they are not at all scientific. I include such books of the future, of course, here too, among my dreams and hopes for the independence of Russian thought in general.

Read - and do not believe your eyes. You re-read - and you begin to doubt your own understanding of the words and thoughts of the author! We have never seen such a hopeless view of Russia, such a denial! Even the Russian socialists (with the exception of those of them who, by the turn of their personal mind and character, believe only in the power of all-destruction) hope at least for the possibility of a prosperous economic reorganization in our country ... They write to me from Moscow that some young people patriotic sentiments, at first they were plunged into deep despondency after reading Mr. Solovyov's article. Their feeling is understandable, but it is not fundamental. Let them be comforted. G. Solovyov wants to believe in what he wants; but we, not blinded by his philosophical passion, his ardent love for the idea he has chosen, have no motives or grounds for agreeing with him in his special kind of pessimism: national pessimism, so to speak. Even if we assume that he is right in his main prophecy, in the ultimate goal of his sermon, that is, in the fact that sooner or later there will be a union of the two now warring sisters of the Churches, then this is still far away. Until then, a lot of water will flow away, and until then a lot of such events will take place, which should have a strong impact on the activity of Russian thought ... "

In this work of Leontiev there are several more important theses that are not related to Solovyov:

"- The stratifying measures of Peter and Catherine covered the entire life of the vast state with an iron network of systematic discipline; this discipline, accustoming some to power, and others to obedience, contributed to the development in all strata and divisions of society

characters strong, passionate and self-possessed, complex and solid, SUBTLE AND courageously rude.

- We cannot wish for our homeland such an artificial and ephemeral dominance as France enjoyed under Napoleon III for only 20 years!

- Someday you need to die; no terrestrial social organism, neither state, nor cultural, nor religious, will escape death and destruction.

The Savior foretold destruction of Christianity itself on earth, and those who prophesy for us on this earth some unprecedented and complete triumph of the "militant" (i.e., earthly) Church preach something like a heresy, contrary not only to the teachings of the Orthodox clergy,

but also the gospel teaching.

- Russia will die someday. And even when, taking a mental look around the entire globe and the entire composition of its population, you see that there is nowhere to wait for new and unknown, strong-willed tribes, because they are no longer among the undoubtedly outdated humanity, then one can almost certainly predict that Russia may perish. only in two ways, either from the East from the sword of the awakened Chinese, or through a voluntary merger with a pan-European republican federation.

— There is also a third possible outcome, which Europeans hostile to us have long and more than once pointed out with horror and disgust: "Russia is something like a gigantic Macedonia, which, taking advantage of the discords of the Western peoples, will gradually subjugate them all to its Monarchic power."

Macedonia had neither its own institutions, nor its own customs and tastes. She had only one strength - the habit of strong Royal power; from all other sides, we do not see any specificity in its history ... "

I hope that the cited part, less than a quarter, of Leontiev's work illustrates how the most benevolent researcher objects to Solovyov. And behind all the private points there is a main watershed: Solovyov crosses out, closes the history of Russia: 1) for the sake of his Great Goal (surrender to the Pope) and 2) simply because of the rejection of all manifestations of Russian life. So he sorts out (discarding as worthless) these manifestations. Russians: rural community, science, philosophy, art.

And a very remarkable moment - it is absent from Leontiev, but I will add: Solovyov rejects Russian science as a bunch of "laborers, collectors of material" at the moment when Dmitry Mendeleev had already published the book "Organic Chemistry" (1861, in

Britain has been reprinted 13 times), has already discovered the Periodic Law of Chemical Elements (February 1869), has already been announced (by his colleague) a report at a meeting of the Russian Chemical Society on March 6, 1869, foreign publications have already gone since the same year. And this expression "laborer collector" is abandoned despite the fact that he, Solovyov, had the honor of personally communicating with Dmitry Ivanovich! In "Treasured Thoughts" (1905), Mendeleev mentioned: "... My late friend V. Solovyov", however, in the context of objections to the students' apostle.

But Dmitry Ivanovich, with a breadth of interests (mineralogy, chemistry, metrology, meteorology, physics, industrial technologies, shipbuilding, agriculture, tariff policy, economics, aeronautics, journalism) reminiscent of the geniuses of the Renaissance, devoted much of his time to ... spiritualism.

On the initiative of D. I. Mendeleev, the Russian Physical Society came out with sharp criticism of spiritualism. On May 6, 1875, "a commission was created" to check all the "phenomena" that accompany spiritualistic sessions." The meetings were held on May 7, 8, October 27. Some comrades-in-arms, such as F. Ewald, leave the commission because, as he wrote to Mendeleev, "... reading books (spiritualistic) and so on has made me a resolute disgust for everything related to spiritualism, mediumism too."

The commission revealed a number of deceptions, the use of psychological manipulation by "mediums" and ... an abyss of the wildest superstition of the audience. Mendeleev also had to respond to a flurry of letters and publications from defenders of table-turning.

In solidarity with Fyodor Ewald, I present this spiritualistic collision for a more complete representation of the level of the then society. And, of course, it is important, symptomatic, that V. Solovyov, the ruler of the thoughts of the then society, was a spiritualist.

Here, too, fate took care, as in the case of 11 soldiers who died in the Winter Palace, to twist the plot twice. There Solovyov flattered before Leo KhSh, gathering a coalition "for bashi-bazouks", against those soldiers in the Russian-Turkish war of 1877-1878, and three years later he raised the society to protect their killers, Zhelyabov and company. And here the "prophet" spiritualist Solovyov ranked one of the greatest scientists in world history among the "labor collectors", and at the same time it turns out - a fighter with the "source of Solovyov's inspiration."

But just don't count that Dmitry Ivanovich was also registered as a "laborer" because of some offense for his spiritualism. No, Solovyov simply did not see Mendeleev. We need to represent this well.

idle mind. Scholarship of the type that is beautifully defined by Leo Tolstoy: "First, notebooks are made from books read

extracts, then from these notebooks they make up their own book.

Above is how Solovyov criticized Danilevsky and all the like, "creeping theories, too committed to facts", opposing them with his own - "winged"!

With an eternally distracted look, an inability to see details, Solovyov's life in general reminds me very much, oddly enough, of Chernyshevsky, described in detail by Nabokov in the plug-in, in the novel "The Gift", the book of his hero.

It may be objected: Chernyshevsky is a materialist (one of the most famous in Rus'), and Solovyov is an idealist. But remember what Nabokov saw best in Chernyshevsky, what he mocked the most:

"Chernyshevsky ... did not distinguish a plow from a plow; confused beer with Madeira; could not name a single forest flower, except for the wild rose... adding with the conviction of an ignoramus that the flowers of the Siberian taiga are the same as those that bloom all over Russia... making up for any lack of concrete knowledge with some simple general thought... with a particle of pus in the blood ... He was helpless in practical matters, weak in health, whiny, could not swim, ride a horse, could never fix anything, but he beat, soiled, spoiled everything. In hard labor, having nothing to do, he dug canals - and almost flooded the road, which was vital for the Vilyui people. The same awkwardness, clumsiness, ineptitude with his wife, who cheated on him with his closest friends and with any student he met, a Polish emigrant, a gendarme captain ... "

Entomologist Nabokov perfectly discerned the intangibility of the famous "materialist". Here one suspects that the now popular term "schmuck" is somehow, perhaps abbreviated, connected with the great revolutionary democrat. This very ... "type of Chernyshevsky", an eternally absent-minded talker, will surely remind the reader and his other carriers how he reminds me of Solovyov. The human type is something more primordial, deep, sub-basic than this: "Pay for the materialists, the idealists! Materialists, step forward!

And if sometime in Russian encyclopedias, in addition to articles about scientific, strict terms, phenomena, objects, there will also be articles about popular "memes", slang expressions, then portraits of both will suit the picture for the article "Chmo".

The most famous cuckold in the host of Russian writers of the twentieth century and the eternal bean, the accuser are very similar in their "doctrinality". "All flowers are the same everywhere", and "<

Mendeleev is a laborer of science. And Nikolai Lobachevsky was ignored by Solovyov ... and Chernyshevsky, our world-renowned creator of non-Euclidean geometry, was completely certified

like a "round fool".

The famous chemist Alexander Butlerov in Europe and Russia is also beyond the horizon of attention of the apostle of female students who talked about "Russian science".

Well, except that V. Solovyov, who died four years before the Nobel Prize (1904) was awarded to our great physiologist, had the right not to see Ivan Pavlov. Yes, as a modest lecturer of the St. Petersburg Women's Courses Solovyov could not see - what a demand from him! But ... the "prophet" (!) Solovyov (let's get to this epithet of Berdyaev and other admirers) ... the "prophet" for such an unpredictable Ivan Pavlov is still "failed".

In the previous chapter, I posed the question "... Where does this pose of a company commander at a morning divorce come from, confidently distributing tasks - to entire nations, setting tasks - to Churches and states?" And he promised to express his version of the answer.

The fact is that the position "Russia has no other historical goal than to serve the unification of churches (under the rule of the Pope)" was not dictated by some Russophobic Freemasons to Solovyov. By the way, Freemasonry and the papacy are old enemies. The free distribution of "the only historical goals" to the Russian state, the Orthodox Church is also a reflection of the eras of Paul, Alexander [and Nicholas], which I called the period of self-betrayal, oblivion of national interests. That "big loan" of 1762-1861, the liberation of the nobility and "developed serfdom". Let me remind you that Catherine the Great was excluded from that list of embezzler monarchs as solving national problems (achieving at the cost of five wars the most important natural border - the Black Sea, the reunification of the three branches of the Russian people).

But beyond the war - for the Order of Malta, for the tearful oath over the coffin of Frederick the Great, for the Holy Alliance, for Austria ... for everything that even our most consistent patriot Danilevsky recognized as a "sentimental mistake". It was then that Alexander and Nikolai formed a view of Russia as a plastic material suitable for solving various Great Universal Tasks. In addition, in 1812, according to Engels' very accurate remark, Napoleon not only was defeated, but proved, as a theorem, Russia's fundamental invulnerability to invasion. (Friedrich Engels was, among other things, an authoritative military theorist, to whom, for example, the American Encyclopedia entrusted all military articles.)

Later in my book, after "V. Solovyov", "Silver Age", important for considering the phenomenon of anti-state public opinion in Russia at the turn of the XIX-XX centuries, the main

attention will be paid to wars, statesmen, armies, railways, foreign trade and interbranch balances.

It is noticeable that in states that did not have such invulnerability (and, accordingly, "a sense of their own invulnerability"), protective tendencies act as a decisive factor in public opinion at any historical turns, in state policy. The instinct of self-preservation balanced the revolutionary impulses. For example, France in 1871, in the face of the Prussian invasion, was able to overcome even the strongest, most acute revolutionary disease, looking at its Paris with the Paris Commune simply as a plague city. And she did the same with him, introducing quarantine. Germany in the revolution of 1848 gives birth to Bismarck and, most importantly, stable public opinion, which worked for the Bismarck Line for several decades. Even Nietzsche, an independent mind, no match for the apostle of female students, with all his mockery of the personality of the iron chancellor, leaves his Switzerland, an excellent position at the university, and enrolls as a volunteer in the Prussian army.

Britain calculated the conditions for its invulnerability a century and a half ahead: a) a fleet, b) the absence of a hegemon in Europe. Further - two words across the pseudo-patriots, who stand on the fact that everything in Russia is the greatest, including people's suffering. So, the position of the forcibly mobilized sailors of the British fleet was much worse than the position of the Russian serfs, even if we accept the one-on-one version of Radishchev. And so the uprising in the British fleet in the era of the Napoleonic Wars won. But the elected leaders of the British uprising did not behave at all like the anarchist sailor of Kronstadt, who shot her officers. In view of the then real Napoleonic threat, they developed and signed with the British Lord of the Admiralty the most complex, multi-point agreement, a kind of "schedule" for the further passage of their "uprising", so as to exclude any damage to combat duty.

Yes, in general, and Russia in 1812, inclusive, did not feel absolutely invulnerable, and all its internal political conflicts were resolved here, taking into account the preservation of their fatherland. But then two factors fatally combined: on the throne - the monarchs were embezzlers who forgot about the national interests of Russia, in society - a feeling of the country's security issue forever resolved.

This feeling, and without any Engels, reigned in the country. Simple sound calculation suggested that it would still not be possible to assemble a larger coalition against Russia than in 1812, that Napoleon showed the absolute maximum possible - and they coped with this in six months.

The result of the chronological coincidence (the first half of the twentieth century) of these two trends was the formation of our intelligentsia: anti

state, outside the national, outside the church (nuance: "outside" - all the same, we will not say too much "anti").

Solovyov's casus lies in the fact that he, as it were, lied over the basic flaws of two periods: the first half of the 20th century (relatively speaking, "monarch-squanderers") and the turn of the 20th-20th centuries ("silver decadence").

During the "Two Alexandria" period, the systemic flaw of the state was eliminated, the initial justice of the device was restored, the operation of the "Social Contract" was renewed, in the words of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (and almost everyone expressed it then), and disappeared, after the Crimean War, a false sense of the forever resolved issue of Russia's security. But Solovyov held out that "league" badge, renewed the tradition of non-national thinking, from the 1820s to the 1880s. Then they thought about the "Holy Union", now about "God-mankind". Let me remind you that Solovyov's "God-manhood" consisted in the world theocratic domination of the Pope and was achieved at the price of a mere trifle - the sacrifice of Russia as a state.

To put it more precisely, then and now only a few, influential units thought about it, establishing a certain mental vector that excludes the thought of security, the preservation of the country. And the consequences of this very fact influenced the entire intelligentsia. Remember how pointer arrows, compass arrows are drawn: a stylized arrow with a tip and tail. This "dualism", the two-pointedness of the arrow in terms of the mental vector showed: a) where to look, b) what to turn away from.

And the whole thickness of our intelligentsia, figuratively speaking, was not touched by the tip, but rather tickled by the feather tail of the arrow. I'm still trying to find a similarity to our case. In the direction of "where to look" - they didn't particularly look out for anything (and the Holy Alliance did not flourish, and Solovyov's Pope did not shine over the whole world), but "what to turn away from" - with this it worked out, it worked out very well.

This is the reason for Solovyov's loitering over the pages of the first quarter of this book. I think that in the kaleidoscope of Russian history, exactly that person was found and singled out. The attention paid to it is attention to the microbe identified as the most dangerous. Personally, Solovyov is important, but as a bright representative of the entire strain. There are two levels of connections:

- at the tactical level, at the level of action, act, Solovyov, with his defense of terrorists, connected the generation of Karakozov, Zasulich, Zhelyabov with the generation of Savinkov, Kalyaev, Azef, Kamo, Sverdlov;

- at a distant, strategic level (in physics there was a term "long-range action"), at the level of thought, books, he connected the mistakes of the period of "squandering kings" - over the blessed period of creative work "Two Alexandria" - with the "last" of the Romanovs.

And that Solovyov pose of a company commander at a morning divorce, confidently distributing tasks to states, peoples and Churches - from there. Only the direction of Solovyov's idle thought, its choice

"soldiers", "cubes" is associated with his cabinet studies (he studied a lot the history of the Churches, the history of the separation of Catholicism and Orthodoxy). The parrot, whose cage hung in the sailor's/pirate's cabin, differs in approximately the same way from the parrot from the merchant's living room.

But the badge of Solovyov's "bonding" unites and multiplies not only all the mistakes of (his) past. The Bickford cord will be stretched in (our) today, Solovyovism is also guessed in the combination of "evangelical" demands on existing governments with patronage of terrorists in the "dashing 1990s". This virus begins especially successful work precisely in the period of weakening state thought.

Solovyov's "Philosophical-evangelical ultimatum" was first presented to Alexander III... unsuccessfully, but thirteen years later he finally found a "suitable" addressee. And Solovyov is an enemy to match.

Idleness and irresponsibility - this Soloviev infection is still active today, and, probably, all the time. In Russian social thought, there seems to be no immunity to this infection; we are weak to "Solovievism" like the northern peoples are to alcohol. For example, in Britain, immunity was found for a similar disease: the famous herald and advocate of common sense Chesterton. Our closest candidate for this role, Konstantin Leontiev, turned out to be very, very weak. Weak not in thought, but in action. Wrote the good, clever work cited above in defense of Danilevsky against Solovyov. Well, pretty... very... conceptual. And Chesterton published hundreds of short essays against virtually the same enemy. Miserable liberal parrots, united in the mafia, clack, caste, in fact, the enemies of common sense, life itself, so Chesterton takes life and common sense as allies in their everyday, almost everyday manifestations, up to the drawings of postcards, educational problems .. In a recent article, touching on a painfully weak family, demographics, juvenile justice, I gratefully quoted Chesterton: "We have the right to order children; If we started convincing them, we would deprive them of their childhood."

And in the case of the Russian variety of this contagion, the "Soloviev syndrome", it would be more effective to open the fan of all his private stupidities: his "rating" of Russian scientists, his hopes for the Pope Leo XIII, his spiritualism, his completely miserable sense of humor (that's really what you don't pretend; if you give 4-5 more pages - you would be amazed at how clumsy, pitiful were his imitations of Kuzma Prutkov, Alexei Konstantinovich Tolstoy).

Our "Chesterton" (Leontiev), alas, did not reach it, did not leave its narrow circle of readers. So with your unheard

warnings and died, having received a condescending article in the Encyclopedia of Brockhaus - the same Solovyov:

"... He expressed his extreme opinions without any reservations even at a time when this could bring him nothing but general contempt and ridicule. Most of the political, critical and journalistic works of L. combined in the collection "East, Russia and Slavs" (M., 1885-1886). After that, he published a number of articles in the Citizen, under the general title "Notes of the Hermit." One of them, "National Policy as an Instrument of the World Revolution", published in a separate brochure (M., 1889). During the life of L., little attention was paid to him in literature; only articles

N. S. Leskova ("Voice", 1881 and "News", 1883) and VI. Solovyov ("Rus", 1883). After his death, in addition to obituaries, the following articles appeared: V. Rozanova in "Russian. Bulletin" (1892), A. Alexandrov (ibid.),

Vlad. Solovyov in "Rus. review" (1892), book. S. Trubetskoy in "Vestn. Europe" (1892), P. Milyukov in "Vopr. philosophy and psychology" (1893),

L. Tikhomirova in "Russian. review" (1894), priest. I. Fudel (ibid., 1895). By the abundance of material for characterization, the articles of Fr. Fudel and Mr. Alexandrov ... "(VI. Solovyov" Leontiev, Konstantin Nikolaevich.) , , article

Why Solovyov? Why Brockhaus? This is discussed in the following lyric-encyclopedia digression.

Chapter 7

The phenomenon of bringing together all the information about the world from a politically verified point of view at that time in the "Great Soviet ...", "Small Soviet ..." and again "Great Soviet ..." is well known, and in total, therefore, in three encyclopedias published during the existence of the USSR. A powerful, visible manifestation of state influence on the worldview of its citizens.

So they were remembered: the first - "Big ...", impressive black volumes - "Stalin's". Further: a new version of the history of the world was reflected in "Khrushchevskaya", in proportion to his term of office of the "Small Soviet Encyclopedia", ten green volumes. And then - again "Big ...", "Brezhnevskaya" - fifty red ones. Since childhood, it has been my favorite reading, a magnificent, vivid image of time. In the "Small", green, of course - articles-refutations of the predecessor, "Big", "Stalin". And some general fussiness - a funny and somewhat unexpected portrait of the Khrushchev era. The article "The Thirty Years' War" has 20 lines and ... a deadly dreary scattering of all kinds of ... ballet dancers of Tajikistan, deputies of the Upper. Council, prominent figures of the Communist Party of Madagascar...

A "big" , "Stalinist" - mysterious, semi-forbidden. In our in a small town in one library it was not at all, and in another

the black-uniform array of volumes stood in such a far corner, to which, for some reason, no one approached. Schoolboy, library frequenter, me

I remember very well my quiet lonely crossing of the invisible border, five or seven steps to the mysterious rack: the eye runs over a wild set of words that quite accidentally fell on the alphabetic boundaries of the volumes and therefore placed on the spine. "Variloid - Vibrator" is the seventh volume, where the article "Waterloo" with a map of the famous battle.

Several pages of the article "Stalin" in the "Stalinist" encyclopedia were - no, not torn out - neatly, very thinly cut, probably with a razor, so that the loss was noticed only by the broken page numbering. Many years later, I also learned of "The Implementation of the Decisions of the 21st Congress of the CPSU," Khrushchev's secret report on the cult of personality. Only by looking closely, it was possible to distinguish at the very spine the thinnest, less than a millimeter strip - the remains of seditious pages. The same was done with other articles related to the mysterious topic ...

It's in the libraries. And private subscribers of the Great Soviet Encyclopedia (2nd edition) received large envelopes by mail in 1953 containing: 1) separate sheets of the encyclopedia with the article "Bering Strait", 2). Special Notice: "To TSB Subscriber. The State Scientific Publishing House "TSB" recommends removing pages 21, 22, 23 and 24 from the fifth volume of the TSB, as well as a portrait pasted between pages 22 and 23, in exchange for which pages with new text will be sent to you. With scissors or a razor blade, cut off the indicated pages, keeping the margins near the spine to which new pages should be glued.

In the fifth volume of the TSB on pages 21-24 there was an article "L. P. Beria ", the mentioned, but not named" portrait, pasted between 22 and 23 pages "- his portrait. A

In my regional library, alas, that article with the Bering Strait, which suddenly got so incredibly lucky with an alphabetic neighbor, was never pasted. Replace him like a sick opera prima...

Oh, if the Khrushchevites weren't afraid of him (not named in the notice to "TSB subscribers") and took into account that he, appointed to the NKVD only in 1938, released more than 300,000 victims of 1937, and made an atomic bomb ... In general, they would not have shot him, but sent him to his former camps, and if he could introduce himself ... And here a stunning picture is seen. The prisoner, as you know, should give only numbers about himself: "c/c no... article no...". And that one, unnamed, would report: "TSB, volume 5, pages 21-24" ...

Many years later, I learned that such was the fate of that very famous French Gadapae Epsus d'Alembert, the "second Bible" of Diderot, d'Alembert, and others like them... when the Council of State decided

that "... the benefit brought to art and science does not at all correspond to the harm done to religion and morality" ,

And

French subscribers began to receive regular volumes through the police, with pages cut out. The world coup, revolutions, including the Great French looked like "footnotes", like an appendix to the articles of Voltaire, Montesquieu, Helvetius and to ... 1.5 million (then) livres earned by the publisher Le Breton, only from the first edition, and not counting income from translations into European languages.

Now it seems to me that the influence of encyclopedias, in addition to the actual download of the amount of information, also had some kind of irrational component. Not just a collection, a Babylonian pandemonium of articles about the whole world, but also a kind of semblance, a sketch of the Last Judgment, carried out by the state power over the history of mankind that was available at that time, which reached the period of its powers. For me, a teenager who had not yet heard of the "Great Style", then to beat about "Stalinist", "imperial" (in textbooks about I.V. Stalin - one and a half sentences), who had not seen a single "Stalinist skyscraper", nevertheless appeared some foreboding when I then approached the black volumes lined up in front of me, as if in a parade. It turns out that even the pages cut to the very spine also reflected the era. And the complete absence of information was paradoxically manifested by a drawing that carried its own information, as when stuffing paint through a stencil.

Now, looking closely, I was convinced that in reality the volumes were not black, but dark-dark blue, called "cyan" by printers.

At the same time, it turns out, and also many, many years before the current information explosion, which stripped naked, including Nikita Sergeevich, I had a subconscious feeling of his era. The ten fussy green volumes that were printed during the reign of the then leader were generally a mystic, since if they had not all come out before 1964, the publication would have been interrupted or heavily corrected. I checked: indeed, the last, 10th volume was printed in 1960. Khrushchev's 10-volume "Small Soviet Encyclopedia" was also in our home cupboard, there was no need to go to the library. In fact, she is still at my house. I remember that her articles at that time constantly left some dissatisfaction, a desire to clarify and supplement everything. It seems that I had to take into account the initial difference between the "Large" and "Small" formats and make allowances for the possibilities of a fivefold larger volume ... but still, the number of articles in the "Khrushchev" encyclopedia gave rise to a general condescending attitude towards her, as now towards her contemporaries, and, it turns out, namesakes - panel "khrushchev". It seems that now you understand objective predestination, but still a small injection of ingratitude has been received. Plus it was annoying

(returning to the paper "Khrushchevs", i.e., to the "Khrushchev's" encyclopedia) that next to the necessary articles, uninvited, crowding neighbors that take up precious space, all sorts of "prominent figures of the Communist Party of Madagascar", and for some reason still all with photographs, to think about it - so pure absurdity ...

With this lyrical-encyclopedic digression, I brought to that interesting fact, which should be thought about separately. It turns out that before the revolution there were no "royal" encyclopedias! Although they remembered the "French encyclopedists" who turned the history of the world, but ... in the 20th century and the beginning of the 20th century there were no, say, "Alexandrinskaya" or later "Nikolaev" encyclopedias. And she was ... right, she is the most - "Brockhaus and Efron."

This is how the Great Soviet Encyclopedia defines predecessors in its article: "Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary", the largest pre-revolutionary Russian universal encyclopedia, published by a joint-stock publishing company

F. A. Brockhaus - I. A. Efron. Consists of 86 vols. (82 main and 4 additional), published during 1890-1907. The largest scientific forces of that time were involved in the creation of the dictionary:

D. I. Mendeleev, A. I. Beketov, A. I. Voeikov, D. I. Anuchin, Yu. M. Shokalsky, N. M. Knipovich, A. O. Kovalevsky, A. I. Sovetov, etc. Like all Russian encyclopedias of pre-revolutionary times, B. and E.

e. With. not distinguished by the unity of ideological principles. In the conditions of old Russia, the implementation of such a large and complex publication as a multi-volume universal encyclopedia was possible only through more or less close cooperation of representatives of different worldviews (for example, the Philosophy section was headed by the idealist philosopher V. S. Solovyov). However, the great saturation of the dictionary with factual material, the abundance of bibliographic information retains its importance as an important reference publication. Lit.: Kaufman I. M. Russian encyclopedias, c. 1, M., 1960.

It's a pity, but for some reason no one has yet paid attention to this paradox: "tyrants, autocrats, who crushed freedom of speech, social thought, brazenly invaded, strangled martinets ... etc.", however, they completely gave the right to form the worldview of Russians Messrs. Brockhaus and Efron. And those, in turn, entrusted one of the most important sections, "Philosophy", to Vladimir Solovyov. Almost all articles related to philosophy: "Kant", "Hegel", "Positivism" (with redirection to - "Kant") - all written by V. S. Solovyov. And, in my opinion, this is very serious, it is directly related to the picture of the world that was taking shape in the minds of the intelligentsia at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. If an intellectual could read an article by Solovyov in magazines, or Konstantin Leontyev (as you could see above, he argued against this), then here, in the final "collection of human wisdom", the high priest, the monopoly interpreter was the very one ...

And if I said: "I think this is serious," then it is necessary to review and clarify in detail: almost the entire philosophy of "Brockhaus" was at the mercy of Solovyov. Nevertheless, about 30 articles belong to a certain Ivan Lapshin, I can't say that he was a student (the only suitable date of birth is 1870), but certainly Solovyov's colleague ... yes, yes, in those odious St. Petersburg women's courses.

But Solovyov is the "editor of the department of philosophy", and all other philosophical articles are his. Apart from, of course, the articles about Solovyov himself, which were obscenely enthusiastic. Or, to clarify: enthusiastic - to the point of oblivion of the "encyclopedic style" itself.

All articles are written in the dry style that has prevailed for almost three hundred years in encyclopedias, dictionaries, and other publications of this kind. But here the authors K. Arseniev and E. Radlov - excuse me, here the banal pun was simply originally laid down - they are flooded with nightingales. Two authors because VI. Solovyov in "Brockhaus and Efron" is devoted to two articles, more precisely, even three - there is also a separate "Soloviev Vladimir Sergeevich (addition to the article)", also written by E. Radlov.

I will reproduce these encyclopedic "trills":

"His things and books, according to a person who knew him closely (L. Z. Slonimsky in Vestnik Evropy, 1900, No. 9), "usually were in different places; sometimes in the cold autumn he went out in a summer rake, because he had left his winter dress somewhere or had forgotten it. Disregard for the physical side of existence, for worldly goods (as far as they concerned him personally), was reflected in the whole system, or rather, in the disorder of his life: he sometimes spent whole months in complete solitude, doing without anyone's services, he himself carried firewood and stoked the stove, put himself a samovar. He worked indefatigably, sometimes spending several nights in a row at his desk, not ceasing to work even during physical suffering, without undertaking the right treatment. All this gradually undermined his body, which had never been strong: the doctors who treated him during his last illness found several serious ailments in him. He died on July 31, 1900 in the estate near Moscow (Uzkoe village) Prince. P. N. Trubetskoy, with whose brother, Sergei Nikolaevich (Professor of Philosophy at Moscow University), he was close friends ... "

And this is "seasoned, strict encyclopedic style"! Through the trembling of disgust from such bad taste, you will only notice once again: "Klaka is a great power!" As the hysterical party picked him up after that naively vile speech of March 1881, it carried him all his life, and entered it into the encyclopedic dictionary. And what a shame it is, if you think about it: the philosophy of Russia, all at the root, is at the mercy of the specialists from the women's courses!

On this "encyclopedic" quote, I must finally, in marine terms, "change tack, shift the rudder", slightly change the course of the story. This quote is by no means given by me for a quick conclusion, something like: "Look how this summer flyaway taught Tsar Alexander III how to deal with the murderers of his father ... even threatened with a public boycott."

No, now I want to say that it is really possible, VI. Solovyov was such a good-natured, absent-minded person. "Investigations on the Case of Solovyov V.S.", I repeat, I did not conduct, everyday "compromising evidence" did not

collected. I studied only his texts and public speeches. If he called a couple of times a "habiter" (a statement of fact), then only as an example of the interconnectedness of personal and domestic and socio-political irresponsibility.

And that Brockhaus article and several similar memoirs give a generally reliable picture: yes, good-naturedly absent-minded. This is where the root of the typical Russian-intellectual problem lies: complete irrelevance. Well, imagine, on the threshold of the war of 1812, to remove Barclay de Tolly and replace ... with Dr. Haas. Indeed, after all, he is a "holy German", and he said: "Hurry to do good!" Appointed - that would have happened: good, probably. Replace Ataman Platov with another famous cavalryman, "Don Quixote of Kamancha"...

Yes, in fact, what kind of jokes, paradoxes of the author! In the 1860s, a tottering society seriously believed that another 9-10 terrorist attacks - and the tsar would make concessions, and the populist government would come to power. And the main candidate for the premiere was... Chernyshevsky! Yes, Nikolai Gavrilovich, that most vividly described "schmuck". Nabokov also said (indirectly) about those rumors of that time... Yes, again, what kind of rumors are there when in 1917 a "clone" of Chernyshevsky really became prime minister. He is also the author of ... eleven newspaper articles, a lawyer who lost all lawsuits ... And let's remember his very first steps! - "letting go of Finland", he drew the state border almost along the northern suburbs of Petrograd. A normal high school student, not absent-mindedly good-natured, like Chernyshevsky, Solovyov, Ulyanov, would remember that here Russian wars were fought only with Sweden, that Russia, which did NOT take away any sovereignty from the Finns, could, releasing a bird into the wild, and determine the border by results if not wars, then negotiations. But how could the author of the Iskra articles conduct such negotiations? Okay, they laid down 127 thousand (the losses were only in the first Soviet-Finnish war of 1939-1940, and there was also the Second Finnish War, as part of the Great Patriotic War), corrected the border.

I can throw a fresher case: the very important foreign trade division Vneshposyltorg (supplying all Soviet foreign collectives and a host of other delicate missions) after the events of 1991 was subordinated to a guy, a member of the famous Living Ring on August 19-21. This is verifiable, I know how it works. But ... I only worked in

unit, and how many ... Moreover, the police, after 1991, I remember, were headed by associate professor (?) Murashov, they say, is a good person.

In general, approaching, according to the plan of this book, to the "Station Bottom", closer to the Bottom of the Empire and the Dynasty, this topic, Russian-intellectual inappropriateness, cannot be avoided in any way. and VI. Solovyov was extremely out of place in the role of "ruler of the thoughts of the era" ... as, alas, Nikolai Romanov in the role of tsar. But if talking about the tsar, the anointed one, requires taking into account and comparing all Russian precedents: accessions, elections, overthrows, murders, self-proclamations, abdications... then about the "ruler of thoughts", the intellectual leader of the era of Russian decadence, one can draw some conclusions on his

works - texts, speeches. And here, a conscientious approach requires dividing the corpus of his writings into two parts. Relatively speaking: 1) Solovyov for the units and 2) Solovyov for the masses.

The works "Philosophical principles of integral knowledge", "Criticism of abstract principles", "Reading about God-manhood", "Justification of the good" require the analysis of specialists, I do not have such qualifications. The topic of my research: NOT philosophy, NOT Solovyov's prophecies and spiritualism, but the phenomenon of "Solovievism" (if the most prominent poets of the era, philosophers, journalists were proud of the title "Solovievites", then the appearance of "Solovievism" is also legitimate). The most important examples of Solovyov's influence on mass consciousness can be considered even in a short pamphlet.

1. Solovyov's article "Russia and Europe" (against the book of the same name by N. Ya. Danilevsky) - its analysis by Konstantin Solovyov is given.

2. Speech ... March 1881 (teachings to the king and the threat of a public boycott).

3. "Declaration on anti-Semitism" ("Noisy chatter had its usual effect" - Korolenko).

Probably, his most famous work "Three Conversations" can also be included in this section.

Check, the whole book - languid conversations, retellings of newspaper news, the only remarks - in parentheses: (dryly), (briskly), (Loudly), (in an undertone). It is very similar to newspaper reports on the Congresses and Plenums of the CPSU with the options: (Applause) (Stormy applause) (Animation in the hall).

Not the slightest characteristics of these "talkers". Although, in truth

speaking, more or less memorable images are not needed here, but

if suddenly needed? It was then that the apostle of the female students would be guarded by another collapse.

And after these three tortured conversations, Solovyov encloses a "Brief Tale of the Antichrist." The same characters from somewhere take the manuscript of a certain elder Pansofius.

Lady: Well, read on. "Mr.
7" (reads): ...

And another 34 pages (in a book of my format) of a boring, helpless imitation of Dostoevsky's Legend of the Grand Inquisitor, from which only one conclusion can be drawn: Solovyov was afraid

the coming of the Chinese and the Antichrist.

Chapter 8

Solovyovism is a craving for all confusion, self-destruction, non-existence, starting from the confusion of his personal and public morality, the gospel "do not kill", presented to the government of the country.

In the book "Apocalypse in World History", dedicated to the fears of 2012 and previous doomsdays, I noted that even the most universal, global-cosmic, global catastrophes, which seem to equalize everyone and everything - from the British queen to the Bangladeshi goner, even in reactions to some asteroid Apophis covering the entire Earth, or the planet Nibiru, putting down a single date of death for all seven billion people, the differences in perception are so great that they provide considerable material for social psychologists. And always a certain part of humanity perceived this as welcome news. You can dismiss them with signs: "Losers. Envious. Inhumans..."

But the thing is that a universal end, or a global upheaval that completely changes the picture of life, in general, a "bloody renewal", is desired not only by a certain part in humanity, but also by a certain part in man. In a much wider layer of people than complete losers, this craving for self- and universal destruction sits. And periodically this will to die resonates on a large scale, for example, on the scale of a country, for example, Russia.

In the same book, I considered one of these periods of self-destruction, the 20th - early 20th centuries, from the nihilists, the "Narodnaya Volya" to the revolution, the Civil War.

Unlike the previous one (split), the beginning of this period of Russian self-destruction, AutoAmageddon, is marked clearly, like a shot from a starting pistol. Actually, this was a pistol shot - by Dmitry Karakozov, on April 4, 1866, exactly 200 years after the split. That pioneer attempt on the Emperor Alexander the Liberator spawned a host of imitators. We will say: "set the fashion", nihilists will object: "he set an example of heroic self-sacrifice". It could be in your

it is their turn to object to them, to cite a fact that, alas, then passed by the mass consciousness. After all, Karakozov suffered from catarrh of the stomach, which caused terrible torment and, with the then level of medicine, did not give the slightest chance of a cure. A huge part of the suicides of that era, according to medical statistics, was caused precisely by catarrh of the stomach. During the investigation, he confessed: "... One of the main motives for committing the crime was my illness, which had a heavy effect on my moral state. She led me first to the idea of suicide, and then, when the goal was presented not to die in vain ... "

In this, Demetrius, the pioneer of Terror, has both an anamnesis and a complete "case history" of their entire caste, but this becomes clearer after reading a few more examples.

V. L. Burtsev, the well-known "hunter for provocateurs", who exposed Azef, a member of the Central Committee of the RSDLP Malinovsky, quotes the words of a secret agent: "You do not understand what we are going through. For example, I was recently a secretary at a congress of maximalists. They talked about terror, about expropriations, about trips to Russia. I was initiated into all these revolutionary secrets, and a few hours later, when I saw my superiors, the same questions were illuminated for me from the other side. I jumped from one world to another... No!.. You do not understand and cannot understand... what emotions I experienced at that time!"

Concerning that period, one inevitably recalls two postulates about the revolutionary generation, quite firmly hammered into our brains. Two illusions, two fillers of convolutions: ethical and intellectual. Ethical: "They did IT for us!". (Well, or: "For the sake of the future!") Intellectual: "They did IT in accordance with certain historical theories, designs, scientific doctrines."

The picture of a clear change in "historical formations: the slave system, feudal, capitalist, socialist ..." - superimposed on the revolutionaries of that era, made us consider the Karakozovs, Kravchinskys, all those PR Apollinaris as some kind of ... planned workers, like heroes of our five-year plans.

Of course, a strong pain in Karakozov's stomach, or ... the itch of L. Mirsky in love undermine both postulates: both that "... for the sake of our (bright) future" and that "... according to a historical plan" ... - but now it is more important to trace the line from the Narodnaya Volya to the "heroes of 1917". The Prophet (by definition of Berdyaev) Solovyov unites them, binds them.

And why, then, this eternal bean should not also be included in the Patriarchs? By the way, Solovyov's persistent public sighing for Sofya Andreevna, the wife, then the widow of Alexei Konstantinovich, in the opinion

memoirists, went beyond the bounds of decency. He often babbled that his central philosophical image of Sophia was inspired by Sophia Andreevna, that it was Sophia who appeared to him in spiritualistic seances.

The childless hanger-on Patriarch is not yet the pinnacle of absurdity. I came across a link to a book by a certain Peter Zuboff (probably one of the emigrants of the first wave), who claimed that Solovyov inspired Dostoevsky to create the image of Alyosha Karamazov. Indeed, when during your lifetime you please so many groups, groups, and in general everyone who saw Russia as the main enemy, it is not surprising that posthumous researchers form such

powerful, influential clan. It is strange how they have not yet found out that it was V. Solovyov who inspired four famous authors, Matthew, Luke, Mark, John, to the main image of their works.

But, probably, this clacker work cannot be refuted by one parody, and in order to shake off the "slap" hanging on Dostoevsky's favorite hero, a formal literary refutation is also required: "Mr. Peter Zuboff, your hypothesis is incorrect. "Kindness of Alyosha Karamazov" included, as you know, his answer to his brother Ivan that the landowner who killed the child can and should be executed (you can find the corresponding page in the novel "The Brothers Karamazov" yourself). And the scattered meanness of VI. Solovyova allowed him to easily step over the body of the child, 14-year-old Kolya Zakharov, who was killed on March 1, 1881, along with the king. For the sake of a moment of glory, "free prophecy", for the sake of a red word at a public lecture, for the sake of driving a dozen meters in the hands of enthusiastic idiots, his and Zhelyabov's students!"

As they sometimes say, "in every joke there is a share of a joke", and to some extent, Solovyov, a familyless hanger-on, can really be called the Patriarch - the Patriarch of Decadence. Abraham, Jacob of the Silver Age intelligentsia. His numerous, "like the sand of the sea", offspring - Russian decadents, that part of society that formed and appropriated "public opinion" - worked as much as they could to defeat Russia in two wars, to win three revolutions. And in the end, she made the state of Romanov's Russia, to put it in protocol, "incompatible with life." I would put it this way: "Worse, uglier and most dangerous of all is the decadent intelligentsia precisely when it thinks what it supposedly thinks." Solovyov's happiness (and Russia's misfortune, which is one and the same) - in a scale of assessments that has gone astray twice. Then - overestimation (a pop lecturer and spiritist was mistaken for a philosopher), today - underestimation (the worst enemy of Russian statehood is again mistaken for ... a harmless philosopher).

Now let's get down to Solovyov's own Silver Age. It is very disgusting and at the same time symptomatic that one of the spiritual leaders of the era, the Solovyov apologist, the founder of the Moscow Religious and Philosophical Society named after VI. Solovyov" Nikolai Berdyaev even after 1917, when he could see perfectly and

to observe the "results of their work", sailing to Europe on a "philosophical ship", he still called that phenomenon: "Russian cultural renaissance", "Russian spiritual renaissance":

"Now we can definitely say that the beginning of the 20th century was marked in our country by a renaissance of spiritual culture, a philosophical and literary-aesthetic renaissance, an aggravation of religious and mystical sensitivity. Never before has Russian culture reached such refinement as at that time ... "

And he doesn't feel that the highest epithet found for that culture is "refined", the closest neighbor and relative -

"thinned", close to perforation.

I would bring much more than Berdyaev, a qualified expert on the "refinement of culture" - Talleyrand. Who happened to be a contemporary and evaluate in a live comparison (!) Three cultures at once: 1) the pre-revolutionary Louis XU, 2) the "delightful fairy tale" (he called it so) of the Napoleonic Empire and 3) the subsequent Restoration era, Louis HUTT. Talleyrand's verdict: "He does not know the real sweetness of life who did not live in the time of Louis XU /"

It can be seen that the sweet smell of decay can seduce many, even such a genius of real politics who tried on a powdered wig, like Talleyrand, what to say about the "refined" Kolya Berdyaev.

That famous "philosophical ship" of 1922, based on the mere fact of the presence of the cargo "Nikolai Berdyaev" on board, would have pulled on another, no less famous image - the "ship of fools" and would have deserved its torpedo, but Pitirim Sorokin also left Russia on it, Zworykin, Sergiy Bulgakov and many people of "mental labor" (real), not involved in the "Solovievism". Well, a polemical "torpedo" on the era of decadence will be released by representatives of the Russian intelligentsia, who were recovering, alas, already in exile, the authors of the famous collection "Change of milestones" Nikolai Ustryalov, Yuri Klyuchnikov Sergei Chakhotin, Alexander Bobrishev-Pushkin.

And once again I repeat Berdyaev's "words about the main thing":

"Prophecy is an intimate theme of the entire spiritual life of V.I. Solovyov. He felt himself called to free prophecy. He is lonely because he carries out a prophetic ministry. and not understood

A whole generation lived without smelling their own rot! We have already spoken about Solovyov's "prophecy", now about the fact that he is "lonely and not understood." It's just a "figure of speech", a verbal cliché taken from some kind of romance. Lonely rocks, my shelter... A romantic hero should be "lonely misunderstood". Despite the fact that the main poets of that era Blok, Vyach. Ivanov flaunted as if he had been beaten

badge, the definition of "Solovievets", and influential journalists, philosophers, writers united in the "Soloviev Society" ...

Truly alone was, alas, Konstantin Pobedonostsev, who tried to fight against the "Solovievism".

And the very mechanism of "making Solovyov" and similar destructive authorities is interesting because this technology has not been lost even today. The already mentioned modern clacker Kortelev published an article about Solovyov in the journal Our Heritage, which includes, let's say right away, Solovyov's half-joking questionnaire:

What are your favorite qualities in a man. - Humor is
your favorite pastime. - The history of religions and secret sciences Your
favorite pastime. - Have a drink with a good person

Your dominant property. - Elasticity in the big and spinelessness in the
small

What shortcoming do you most excuse? - Too fond of me

What offense do you judge most severely? - Injustice against me

What do you think happiness is? - Personal - in mutual love, and public - in the
triumph of truth

What do you think is the biggest misfortune? - To be the wife of Pobedonostsev

What is your favorite Russian prose writer? - I myself and N. Strakhov, as well
as Metropolitan Filaret and Katkov

Your favorite foreign prose writer. - Hoffmann, Pope Leo Khshi Bossuet

What is your current state of mind? - Solid in disasters" Comment by N. Kotelev:

"The set of questions in this questionnaire and in the one that Solovyov filled out for T. L. Sukhotina
largely coincide, the questionnaire published by us is shorter. In terms of time, the
questionnaires should not be far apart from each other: we tend to attribute the
printed one to the mid-eighties (when Solovyov already felt himself persecuted by
the authorities - K.P.

Pobedonostsev, in particular; when he placed great hopes in Leo XIII, the pope of Rome,
famous for his Latin style...). Both attempts to interview V. Solovyov gave very half-hearted
results - the same mixture of serious and disarming

funny..."

I propose to delve even not into the pearl of Solovyov's ardently lascivious imagination (the
biggest misfortune is to be Pobedonostsev's wife), but into an
example of Kotrelev's serious textual work. A qualified publisher, which, of course,
he is, needs to date the published fragment, and as a real clue on the timeline, he sends:
"when Solovyov

already felt persecuted by the authorities - K. P. Pobedonostsev, in particular. This is how legends are created and "the Solovyovs are made." Stamp from Berdyaev - "lonely misunderstood." From Alexander Blok - "monk knight". Now and - "we are persecuted by the authorities, Pobedonostsev, in particular" ...

Now, as well as two chapters earlier, after the list of 11 dead soldiers of the Finnish Regiment, I will make a pause. The reason is the following. Surely the reader has come across books of such a blackish genre, where, studying the most detailed biography of the "hero", they filter out any "compromising evidence", and if the original biography is a large volume, then, as a rule, you can type something on a black article.

I have not read detailed biographies of Solovyov on purpose. Only a Wikipedia article (about 5-7 pages), which everyone who wants to compare its data with my words can certainly do. On the other hand, I had to read and think a lot of texts about the death of the Russian Empire, about Narodnaya Volya and other terrorism, about intellectual decadence, the Silver Age ... and because of the frequent mention of the name of this person, it was simply impossible to ignore him. I really have no intention of publishing an anti-Soloviev pamphlet and hope to soon part with the apostle of female students.

You can believe me or not, but it was at this point, "the persecution of Solovyov by the authorities and Pobedonostsev," that I stopped before the possibility of choice, the "point of bifurcation," to put it in a modern way.

In a small article I read, there seemed to be nothing about Solovyov being persecuted by the authorities. And after reading Kotrelev's article (I'm sure he knows 10 times more than me on this topic), I was determined to go to the library to get something total about Solovyov. After all, I feel, I see from all the indirect facts of the biography: there was no persecution! Find a book, refute Solovyov's clackers?

But at first, laziness opposed the search for the book, I confess. And then a certain feeling appeared ... well, indecent, or something, as if

send filers: follow the daily route, meet the "philosopher of the medium" ...

'So I left it. And he even made a vow to himself not to double-check. The game seemed fair: if there were persecutions, then my book would come out with a flaw. But I decided to follow the path of my assumption: the authorities and Pobedonostsev did not pursue Solovyov. There were teachings of a "lonely misunderstood philosopher" at two leading Russian universities, there were expensive business trips to London, Egypt, there was a staffing in the Academic Committee under the Ministry of Public Education. Even the very benevolent Wikipedia article sees the reason for leaving Petersburg University from two sides: in the intrigues of his former patron, a

Vladislavlev, and perhaps, nevertheless, in the consequences of that public speech in defense of the regicide terrorists. But leaving the departments happens all the time in the scientific community, it is even indecent to compare this, for example, with the torments, academic boycotts of Mendeleev. Here, just for a minute, they covered the cage with a parrot with a scarf ...

BUT the main focus is next. That the official Pobedonostsev "pursued a lone misunderstood philosopher" - quite in the spirit of average ideas, is also a cliché. But what could be the opposite?! Though...

As you know, an assassination attempt was planned on Pobedonostsev at the moment when he was supposed to be at the funeral of Minister of the Interior Sipyagin, the victim of a previous assassination attempt. In today's news, such double attacks are almost commonplace. And after those plans were revealed, Pobedonostsev was forced to significantly limit his movements and meetings until the end of his life. This is a fact, as well as the fact that Solovyov's speech, his ultimatum to the tsar - moved the line of confrontation between the authorities and the terrorists in favor of the latter, helped the Narodnaya Volya recruit a few dozen extra heads. Including from his student students - again, I didn't specifically count, but that they en masse went to the People's Will circles - another verifiable fact ...

Petersburg, October 1905. Provoking the city's excited demonstrators, the second generation, counting from the Solovyov female students, walked along Liteiny Prospekt. Opposite the two-story house where Pobedonostsev lived, they, suddenly forgetting their other revolutionary goals, stopped and shouted all sorts of insults at the "reactionary, persecutor" until dark. Pobedonostsev heard all this while working in his office on his latest text: a new translation of the New Testament. So much for the paradox of "official persecution of the Prophet"...

Alexander Blok, article "Monk Knight": "Now, like ten years ago, everyone recognizes great talent, but many will stop in bewilderment

before any side of his activity. A well-known philosophical school will question the system of mystical philosophy

VI. Solovyov due to the absence of a complete theory of knowledge in it. Not a single camp of publicists will accept Solovyov without reservations for the mere fact that Solovyov affirmed a "holy war" in the name of "holy love" ... VI. Solovyov - a critic? He did not notice Nietzsche, he single-sidedly assessed Pushkin and Lermontov. VI. Solovyov - a poet? And here we have to give him a small place, if you look at him as a "pure" artist. VI remains. Solovyov is a man. There is an exorbitant variety of pictures; memories and anecdotes still do not leave the pages of magazines. What conclusion can be drawn from these contradictory anecdotes about "strange" deeds and words, especially about "strange", and for some, terrible laughter, which everyone remembers with particular pleasure? One conclusion: VI. Solovyov was a very likeable and original person, but with great oddities, not entirely pleasant, and sometimes indecent; but

like all his friends were also very nice people, they forgave this romantic eccentric for his wild antics ... "

In principle, February 1917 was such a "trick", a "contradictory anecdote" of Solovyov's friends and students, who taught him the main thing: irresponsible chatter ("prophecy") - this is the highest calling of the Russian intelligentsia!

And, finally, completing the story of the Patriarch of Decadence, I hope that my brief remarks will not be perceived as sweeping criticism from a "protective position". I hope I have shown that Solovyov really contributed to the extent of his ability to the decay of the empire, and therefore ... No, even if this mess of prophesying, spiritualism, anecdotes and bad dreams were not touched at all by any of his contemporaries, would have lain for a hundred years under silently and would open up only now (in a slightly different country, without its influence), all the same, it would remain the same ...

And the main trouble is that the described talking parrots learned to speak not from people, but also from the voice of another talking parrot, and that one from other parrots, and so on ...

That is why that focus of confusion, unprecedented in stupidity, distorting, applying to the monarch, the current government, to state policy, the requirements became possible, all 1600 years addressed by the Bible only to an individual, to a private person: "Thou shalt not kill", "Love your enemies", "Goodbye everyone." And the whole world understood it in this way, and the Russians - from Vladimir the Baptist to Alexander III - did not demand the "Christian" liquidation of the court and the army, but ...

The only refutation of my comparison seems to be: parrots, as you know, live long, and this one died in 1900, 47 years old, in someone else's office. Medical diagnosis: atherosclerosis, cirrhosis of the kidneys, uremia and complete exhaustion of the body ... "Sick parrot"?

... Berdyaev climbed into the vacant "silver" cage.

In fairness, it should be said that the same "evangelical" demands were addressed to the ruling monarch, just as little appreciated the Russian statehood and another ruler of thoughts, already a real, not "clacked" genius - Count Leo Nikolayevich Tolstoy. He also wrote a letter to Alexander Sh ("... he was killed not by his personal enemies, but by the enemies of the existing order of things: they were killed in the name of some higher good of all mankind") - with a request to pardon the Zhelyabov terrorists in 1881 - no, not at all randomly chosen starting point, that most important fork! True, without the attached threat "otherwise we will renounce you" - this is partly because Tolstoy immensely despised the decadent intelligentsia, and the very idea of being its herald, "mouthpiece" caused a feeling of shame even more acute than shame for "War and Peace", "Anna Karenina", which he often admitted.

The discord of Leo Tolstoy with Russian statehood is a completely different case, and initially this discord was by no means connected with his "ultra-evangelism", "ultra-Buddhism", non-resistance to evil, "simplification" of life, "peasantization" of life, vegetarianism, walking barefoot and others, as they said would my students, "zakosy". No, Tolstoy's discord with the Russian state was caused by the war, more specifically: the Crimean War of 1853-1856.

I proved this, including chronologically, in my 2011 speech at the Nikitsky club. Based on the interdisciplinary approach of the Club of Rome, this meeting of scientists, writers, businessmen, headed by Professor Sergei Petrovich Kapitsa, pays attention to many diverse issues: Russian space, the history of Russian modernization, the problems of interpreting the history of World War II, the concept of the capital (on the recent expansion of Moscow) and such persons as Lomonosov, Witte, Tolstoy. Three speakers on the topic of Lev Nikolayevich analyzed in detail and skillfully his artistic work, journalism, and "Tolstoyism". I set myself a private goal - among all state, public institutions equally rejected by Count Tolstoy: the court, the church, the army, the police, private property, marriage, the death penalty, the oath ... to single out the element from which his "departure" began. After all, his disappointment in the state-social structure was not at all instantaneous - it was a process stretching for 55 years! My answer to the question "What did Count Tolstoy first renounce?", contained in the proposed report, will also be a kind of "transition point" from the cross-cutting theme of these chapters, the spiritual crisis that undermined the empire and dynasty at the beginning of the 20th century, to the chapter "War. Emperors."

"As on the fourth day, we were not easy to carry ..." (Back from the state.)

It is known that today "Tolstoy disputes" diverge in circles from one question, a point thrown by a stone by Lev Nikolayevich: "The State." Even today's tendentious proceedings, such as the one that took place in March 2010 in the Kirov Court of Yekaterinburg, the so-called. The "anti-extremist trial", in which Leo Tolstoy was accused by extremism expert Pavel Suslonov of "inciting religious hatred against the Orthodox Church", admits that the statehood of the Church was the reason for Count Tolstoy's negative attitude towards the ROC. For example, Lev Nikolayevich's verdict on trinitarianism, the doctrine of the Trinity, is simple: "I don't understand," but the points related specifically to statehood (swearing an oath on the Bible in the army, in legal proceedings, the consecration of military units, ships) are criticized by him irreconcilably. And, of course, the very attributes of the state - the army, the police, the court, judicial punishments, Tue. h. executions - angrily and inspired by Leo Tolstoy are overthrown ... In my opinion, it is extremely interesting: which of these very "attributes of the state" was the first to fall into Tolstoy's "black list"? After all, this is not just "the first one that came to hand", under the very heavy hand of the count. This is, in today's popular terms, the "weak link". After all, both friends and foes noted the solidity, consistency, "systematic" of the classic, "accidentally turned up under the arm", in

"Tolstoy" could not be. So: the state church, the police, the army, the court, the person of the monarch, the ministries, private property, the educational system, marriage?

Army. It's the army. This can be briefly proved here chronologically. At least "rewinding the film." What struck Nabokov most of all in ... let's say, "an incident, the case of Pushkin" is that he died literally on the eve of the arrival of photography. The first daguerotypes in Russia appeared almost a month after his death, and Pushkin forever remained "in the imagination", outside the real print. But another art, "the most important of the arts for us", cinema, Leo Tolstoy found. So let's rewind the tape and make sure that long, long before, for example, the condemnation of the death penalty in the well-known pamphlet, the entire trial by jury in the novel "Resurrection", before this "clinch" with state religion in general, before the heyday of the term "critical realism", there was his conflict, "first conflict" with the army. Tolstoy of the 1860s is a good landowner, maybe a little more modestly dressed, but still: buying up estates for fees, for those record 500 rubles. for an author's sheet (or 200 rubles, but I remember it was noted that he had the highest fees in Russia at that time) - this is an attitude to property - author's, land. Even before that, he married Sofya Nikolaevna, baptized his children (attitude towards marriage and the sacraments of the state church ...). And so, having passed even "before" and "before"> ... we will reach that very soldier's song "As on the fourth day we were not easy to carry ..." 1855.

Yes, there were also critical lines about "Napoleon officers" who were ready to kill two hundred souls for a cross or a quarter of their salary - in Sevastopol Tales. But that song is a special case in the biography of Leo Tolstoy. Take his attitude to poetry, his well-known comparison: "as if a peasant were dancing behind a plow", and the fact that "Evgenia

Onegin "he read 26 years old, by chance: at the post station there were no books-magazines, except ... "Okay, poetry, I just need to fall asleep as soon as possible."

For the then meeting, I set a little experiment on myself: I did not look for the text of that song - my collected works of Tolstoy are a simple Soviet 12-volume book, where, of course, it is not. And I came across this text in the anthology "Day of Poetry" for 1986. Here's how

remembered from those years.

"As on the fourth day, it was not easy for us to take away the mountains. Baron Vrevsky, general, molested Gorchakov when he was drunk. "Prince, take these mountains, do not get into a quarrel with me, otherwise I will inform you." All the big epaulettes gathered in councils, even Platz bek-Kok. The police chief Platz-bek-Kok could not invent what to say to him in any way ... "

Well, then the lines known to everyone, the "citation leader": "It is smoothly written on paper, but they forgot about the ravines, and walk along them ..."

What is it about? About one military council that took place in the besieged Sevastopol? About the futility of military planning, planning anything at all? About what happened 10 years before the novel "War and Peace", before the description of that memorable scene on the eve of Austerlitz: "Der erste the martiren column ... The first column is marching ..." - and the sleeping, even snoring Kutuzov. Biographical directories (I consulted them) confirm: "... A satirical song, in the manner of soldiers, about the unfortunate case of August 4, 1855, when General Read, having misunderstood the order of the commander in chief, imprudently attacked the Fedyukhin Heights. The song ("Like on the fourth day, it was not easy for us to take the mountains away"), which touched on a number of important generals, was a huge success and, of course, damaged the author. Immediately after the assault on August 27 (September 8), the hero of the Sevastopol defense, Leo Tolstoy, was removed from the army and sent to St. Petersburg.

But it is absolutely not enough to state that "with Tolstoy... this (the anti-state syndrome) began in 1855, with the Crimean War."

And what kind of war was it, Crimean?!

I'll start with a question suitable for all kinds of TV quizzes, betting: when was the first railway built in the Crimea? And by whom?

Answer: in 1855. And, it turns out, - landed by the British. From Balaklava (their supply port) to the outskirts of Sevastopol. Played a decisive role in supplying the Allied armies besieging Sevastopol.

For thirty years, Nikolai [with Nesselrode dealt with Poland, Hungary, the Holy Alliance, successfully gathering a pan-European coalition against Russia. Against the backdrop of this stormy diplomatic "work" in the army - a unique case in history - absolutely no changes have occurred in 30 years! In terms of armament and tactics, it remained an exact copy, one might say - a "photo" of our victorious army of 1812. So the first failures on the Danube, even BEFORE England and France entered the war ... showed: for the first time in 190 years, the Russian army was inferior to the Turks in armament! Heroism remained the same, the Turkish fleet was defeated at Sinop (the only Turkish steamer, however, escaped from Sinop), but the Danubian principalities were left. Leo Tolstoy, by the way, is not only a hero of Sevastopol, he was in the army during the campaign in the Danube principalities.

The allies, who were in the same year 1812 (a point of comparison, just like the memorable "level of 1913" in reference books) were practically equal to us in armament, over these 40 years made a leap in three main areas: rifled guns, rifled artillery, steam fleet.

That was the First Transportation War, or let's call it the "First

Logistic". First, a maneuverable period: in the Crimea we lost three battles, but still won one (memorable under Balaklava!). For them, the allies, rapid-fire rifled guns and cannons paid with blood according to some established increased casualty rate, but it was still a war similar to the previous ones, with some chances for Russia. The siege of Sevastopol, the first period: we, with cannonballs against rifled artillery shells, are also paying at an increased coefficient, but this is still almost a familiar war: interrogation / counter-inquiry, sorties, repelling assaults. Artillery duels, delivery of shells / cores, replacement of retired guns and crews. We have: on oxen, along country roads, twice a year, in spring and autumn, simply turning off due to dehydration. The British (in the Crimea!): by rail. Further...

From August 5 to August 8, under fire from 800 guns, we lost 900-1000 daily Human.

On August 24, as the dry reference says, "heavy bombardment silenced the artillery of Malakhov Kurgan and the 2nd bastion" ... A few more examples of Russian heroism - and we were presented with a new, non-contact (on our part!) War. The bombing is already tearing out 21/2-3 thousand people a day from our ranks, and most importantly, in the absence of any possibility of inflicting retaliatory losses, approximately like the Serbs and NATO in 1999. Therefore, Prince Gorchakov leaves Sevastopol (its southern, besieged part).

Here it is - the "First Logistics War". Competition of traffic flows, ton-kilometers...

And our leader? Emperor Nicholas ordered: "As a reward for the feats already accomplished and to encourage future ones, I command that every month of service in Sevastopol be counted as a year." It seems like the sovereign controls the Time itself, but ... thirty years of his reign flew by like one worthless, mediocre day.

The fatal mistakes of Nicholas 1 today are often explained by the fact that he was "the last knight of Europe" - honest, straightforward. Here is another well-known image, an epithet from that war: "Sinop victory - the Swan Song of the sailing fleet." Indeed, the line of ships, white sails - bewitchingly beautiful (let's add non-motorized silence, splashing waves) ... perhaps the most striking picture among the illustrations of that time. And complete destruction. However, the only steamship that smokes the sky - the Turks had it in Sinop - breaks through and leaves.

'That is, it was not Leo Tolstoy who removed the romance from the war, smearing in "War and Peace" "fat Napoleon with his trembling left frog," as rarely any of the historical characters in world literature was smeared. Romance, chivalry were swept away by a new generation of weapons. All the "chivalry" of the era was destined to be placed in such a person as Nikolai G. And Leo Tolstoy recorded this on his "sensitive seismograph" ...

And regarding the hero of our dispute - what is the psychological trauma? Indians with bows and clubs against machine guns and cannons - this is heroism without any burdensome thoughts. It is much harder for Leo Tolstoy and the Russian soldiers who found themselves in Sevastopol in the shoes of such Indians: recently they were Europeans, they entered Paris, and then ... As they said to those who squandered in the taverns of that era: "Let you get out." From Europeans to Hottentots.

In Ciagap, Luke Harding (article "Leo Tolstoy - the forgotten genius") asks: why is Russia indifferent to his literary genius? But then he recovers, recalls the current trials.

Pavel Suslonov, an expert on extremism mentioned at the beginning of the article, writes:

Leo Tolstoy's "Preface to the Soldier's Memo" and "Officer's Memo" by Leo Tolstoy, "Preface to the Soldier's Memo" and "Officer's Memo" by Leo Tolstoy, addressed to soldiers, sergeants, officers, contains direct calls to incite inter-religious hatred directed against Orthodox Church ... The memo of a Christian soldier is not the one that says that God is a soldier's general and other blasphemy ... but the one where the words are recalled

writings that we must obey God more than people, and not be afraid of those who can kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. Tolstoy warns the soldiers about the danger: ... having become infected with the charm of armed force based on murder, preached by a gang of robbers ... and the charm of toy amenities and the brilliance of what they call culture, you ... imperceptibly for yourself will lose your virtues - hard work, peacefulness, respect, and you will fall under a terrible power, climbing into the innermost bends of the human soul, under which the present European humanity perishes and languishes ... "

An interesting twist associated with the character of that song - police chief Platz-bek-Kok. He is the first of the "Germans at the military council." Then there will be Weyrother in front of Austerlitz, Pfuell before the onset of Napoleon in 1812, Clausewitz with Wolzogen on the night before Borodino.

Let's remember the found keywords for the crisis of Leo Tolstoy: "the army, the Crimean War" and return to them after completing the tour of Russian decadence.

Chapter 9

"Silver Age" is a term that is difficult to do without in describing the collapse of the Russian Empire. The well-known literary-centricity of Russian history is not only in the significant, objectively measured social and political influence of the masters

Herzen, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Gorky, but also in the fact that their characters have long been perceived as some kind of markers of eras. Alexander P admitted that on the eve of his Great Reforms, in the most difficult thoughts about the liberation of the peasants, reading Turgenev's Hunting Tales personally helped him. Finest hour of Russian literature...

And the teacher and educator of Alexander P was Vasily Zhukovsky.

Even the Marxist Lenin, keeping in mind his "economic basis", "superstructure", delimiting the period of the 19th - early 20th century into the same "three stages" - noble, raznochinsk, proletarian - actually repeated and continued Herzen's literary periodization.

Our literary centrism, which was partly a projection of a page in a textbook of literature of the same period, in the case of interest to us, XX - early XX century, gave the following picture.

The beginning of the twentieth century - an outbreak: the Napoleonic wars, the Decembrists, Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, the Golden Age.

Then a little more boring - Nikolaev's stupor, but ... another trio starts, our literary stayers: Turgenev, Dostoevsky,

Tolstoy. Together with them we go through the fiasco of Nicholas T, the Crimean War, the period of the Great Reforms, disputes throughout the country of democrats, liberals and conservatives, Narodnaya Volya, "going to the people", explosions, murders.

Then a heavy pause. The reign of Alexander III was the least represented in our textbooks. This will confirm the elementary count of the pages devoted to this period in textbooks.

And at the very beginning of the 1900s - again an explosion of events. The abyss is mentioned in names and details. Silver Age. The Soviet textbook gave a picture reminiscent of an hourglass: the Golden Age - a narrow transition - the Silver Age. Again, there is something to talk about.

In part, the previous tsar was to blame himself, he is ours - Alexander the Peacemaker, the absence of wars greatly dried up interest in the era. Giant regions in Central Asia (Turkmenistan) joined peacefully and quietly. One of the most important wars in the history of Russia in the twentieth century - the "Tariff War" with the German Reich (second) - was won by Alexander's best minister, Sergei Witte, also, of course, without firing a shot. The "broad Russian industry" (the expression of that time) that had risen from oblivion, the railways that covered the country, the most powerful ports that carried out real Russian export expansion - all this happened quietly, almost imperceptibly. And on the pages of history textbooks (!) the assessment of the Great Era got through ... the poet, Alexander Blok.

In those years distant, deaf,

Sleep and darkness reigned in the
hearts: Pobedonostsev over Russia
Spread owl wings...

To these well-known provisions, I will add only some points that connect the development of Russia at the turn of the 19th-20th centuries with the Silver Age, the characteristics of this century, its genesis, a list of the main acting characters, in general, everything that allowed me to call it the Melchior Age .

Melchior is a cheap alloy of copper and nickel that has long been used as an imitation of silver. Forks, spoons, knives ... There are fakes, fakes, seriously designed for good luck, but cupronickel is an extremely naive, "petty-bourgeois" replacement for silver. Approximately how diamonds and rhinestones are now correlated ...

Here I let in the long-suffering epithet "petty-bourgeois", and immediately I feel a certain guilt, in any case, the need for clarification. The favorite target of the magazine "Crocodile" "philistines" of the 1950s,

after the hardest decades, those who wanted "everything to shine and silver" on their table are naive people, innocent in comparison with those self-satisfied, jaded, exalted scoundrels of the Melchior age, listeners of Vladimir Solovyov's lectures, greedy spectators of restaurant actions, installations and scandals.

Suppose I am tendentious with my insulting notion "Melchior Age". Let us then start from the dispassionate, long-established definitions of the content of the Silver Age, taken not from pamphlets, but from encyclopedias and reference books:

Decadence, apocalyptic aspirations, a sense of crisis both in life and in art, were associated with the spread of the ideas of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche and Spengler in Russia, on the one hand, and with the anticipation of new revolutions, on the other. Fixing the state of chaos, the awareness of the "end", the Nietzscheans were looking for their Superman, the Symbolists - Androgyne, the Acmeists - the New Adam, the Futurists - the "Willing Man". Extreme individualism, aestheticism (in the decadent part of symbolism), the preaching of the World Soul, a new Dionysianism, catholicity (among the "younger" symbolists) ... "

Let's return to the crossroads of literature and history:

... And there was neither day nor night,

And only - the shadow of huge wings;

He outlined Russia with a marvelous
gaze, looking into her eyes with the
glassy gaze of a sorcerer...

In principle, it happens that the assessments of poets are accepted by historians, but, as a rule, poetic genius in those cases is also supported by a personal lively look: poet + eyewitness, contemporary (Denis Davydov, Zhukovsky in 1812). But this is a strange picture, think about it: Blok, who writes in his diary: "Everything is clouded. March first. Pobedonostsev silently sits on the throne like an owl. This is about March 1, 1881, about the murder of Alexander P, the accession of Pobedonostsev's student Alexander Sh, the career rise of Konstantin Petrovich himself. And compare this entry with the poet's birth year - 1880...

Of course, he represented that era from books, magazines, and if it says: Chief Prosecutor Pobedonostsev pursued a "lonely philosopher", a "knight-monk" - that's all! True, a genius is genius even in his limitations, and Blok, choosing a night bird for Pobedonostsev, grayer, darker, chooses an owl! Eternal symbol

wisdom, companion of the goddess, minted on the coins of ancient Athens. But with the brightness of plumage and talkativeness - yes, it is inferior ...

"Sleep and darkness reigned in the hearts" - and this is correctly noted: the discrepancy between the rhythm of life is noticeable not only on the calendar, but also on the dial. A self-respecting bohemian falls asleep fundamentally not at the same hours as hard workers. Just try to imagine the clubs "Stray Dog", "Shelter of Poets", "Tower" Vyach. Ivanova and other silver age, as well as today's clubs, opening at 7 in the morning, on the factory whistle ...

And most importantly, it was then, in that atmosphere, that the State Duma, then the police, the General Staff, and the "business elite" behaved quite bohemian and "hippie". Recall at least the most famous capitalist of the era, Savva Morozov: when did he manage to manage factories? - spent whole days with Gorky, actress Andreeva, freelance artists, gallery owners, Moscow Art Theater ...

And, they say, he shot himself in Nice.

About the term itself. From the "Metamorphoses" of Hesiod, a division began: under Kronos (Saturn) there was a Golden Age, then under Zeus (Jupiter) - Silver, in the understanding that it is still worse. More similar to us was the application of this model to ancient Roman literature and public life. The golden age, Horace, Ovid, Virgil, then a pause, a lull and - the Silver Age, Martial, Propertius. And in Russia, at first, the definition of "Silver" meant a kind of resumption after a pause, although not at the same level as in the Golden Age. It was later that Berdyaev declared that, after all, we are the most sophisticated, that "Russia has never had such a thing before ...".

And our textbook of literature, as if “shrugging its shoulders”, confirmed: in the 1880s, 1890s, “there were no gentlemen of the writers! .. Two great ones died, the third Tolstoy deigned to get carried away by Tolstoyism. He publicly renounced “War and Peace”, “Anna Karenina” ... He does not write anything literary, sir ... So, silence, sir.

And then all of a sudden - a whole fountain: Blok, Balmont, Bryusov, Bely, Symbolists, Acmeists, Futurists, Imagists ...

To make the picture more convincing, a trick was done: the “healed” Leskov (!), who worked fruitfully right up to 1895, was simply deleted from the scheme. True, he did a lot more to the creators of the scheme, and our literature textbooks were compiled without the author of “Lefty”, “Dumb Artist” at all ...

Further on the culture of the “Bottom of the Dynasty” era, the most sophisticated in the history of Russia, by Berdyaev’s definition, a witness and an important accomplice

crisis of the empire, I will pass through a few telling facts from the Silver Age.

1. Undivided assassination attempt

Evgenia Lang testified: “Bryusov performed with great success, as usual. At the end of the lecture, a young poetess Nina Petrovskaya squeezed in close to them, grabbed a revolver, and aimed at Bryusov’s forehead. But he tugged at her hand with a confident movement. The bullet hit the ceiling. Nina previously had an affair with Bryusov.

This can happen in many creative communities, but everything else is only among the Melchiorites. Shcherbakov and Ashukin, the authors of a book about Bryusov, wrote: “With his characteristic egocentricity, Andrei Bely, who was at that evening, took this as an attempt on himself.”

Andrei Bely himself recalled: “Nina had a fantasy or a relapse to shoot me, but defeated by (my) lecture, she suddenly turned her anger on Bryusov, pulled out a revolver ...”

Not only the assassination attempt, but also the poetic lecture that won over the ladies turned out to be undivided: Bryusov or Bely? (There is still more evidence that Bely.) And according to various recollections, the revolver was knocked out of the hand of the poetess Petrovskaya: Bryusov himself, the poet Sokolov-Krechetov, the poet Alice ...

That first witness, Evgenia Lang, sister of Alexander Lang, also - don’t laugh - a poet (in the Silver Age there were more of them in St. Petersburg than cabbies, bathhouse attendants and policemen combined),

think and play along: since the poetess Petrovskaya had a seven-shot revolver in her hand, she intended to shoot: at Bryusov, and at Bely, and at the poet Sokolov-Krechetov (two bullets? At such an important two-headed poetic bird?), and Elis, and in Langa. And they sent her to a lecture by symbolists, for example, acmeists or imaginists, ego - or simply - futurists.

And you still deign to talk about Pugacheva with Galkin, Kirkorov, Natasha Koroleva with Korolyov, Tarzan, or Bilan with Rudkovskaya and someone else ...

2. Duel... Let's shoot - through Fata Morgana

Once the poet Maximilian Voloshin created, on the basis of the work of the young poetess Elizaveta Ivanovna Dmitrieva, as they say today, the project "Cherubina de Gabriak". He fulfilled his role as a "producer" on a turn-key basis, inventing, in addition to a sonorous pseudonym, several setting biographical touches: a beauty, a Catholic,

the most talented poetess, mysterious, not wanting to appear in the party. Provided initial publicity, wrote a preface to the first selection of Cherubina's poems in the Apollon magazine, No. 2, 1909.

Stormy success. Passionately in love with the "Catholic poetess" Makovsky, the editor of "Apollo", it was necessary to present at least something, and he receives: Her Voice. Cherubina periodically calls him, caller ID has not yet been invented ...

Further features of the image of the Beautiful Stranger broke into the press already against the will of the "producer" Voloshin: "the countess, brought up in a Catholic monastery, fiery red, of rare beauty, lost her mother early, completely devoted to her confessor, full of mystical, almost blasphemous love for Christ, dreams dedicate your life to him.

This is practically a pure condensate of the expectations of the society of that time, its arithmetic mean ideas about beauty, romance, "everything fancy" ...

The artist Nikolai Wrangel meets the trains on which, as reported, she comes to St. Petersburg, and throws herself at the feet of the tenth red-haired girl. Konstantin Somov announced that he was ready to go blindfolded to Cherubina and paint her portrait in order to preserve the secret.

She was definitely seen at the ball at the princess such and such. The main Don Juan of the "party" Nikolai Gumilyov almost already recaptured Cherubina from Makovsky.

Then ... some kind of intrigue with the participation of Mikhail Kuzmin, who received and

giving the editor her phone number. Trembling (probably) Makovsky picks up the phone, dictates numbers to the young lady-telephonist and hears a voice: "Elizaveta Ivanovna is listening."

At the now inevitable personal meeting, Cherubina seemed very ugly to Makovsky (Dmitrieva was limping and suffering from consumption), completely unromantic, and, characteristically, her poems (now) were just as dull. Publications have stopped. The insulted "almost conqueror of the beautiful Cherubina" Gumilyov had a duel with the "producer" Voloshin, fortunately, bloodless.

What is more beautiful: Cherubina de Gabriak or, for example, Lada Dance, Chris Kelmi (another modern rock musician, in the world of Tolya

Kalinkin) - we will leave this to the reader's discretion, more importantly - the well-known principles of symbolist poets: "The life of a poet should be a continuation of creativity" and "The poet must create his own life, like his poems." That is: the biography of the poet is as important as the poems. And - the press to help them! - since the 1900s, unlike those distant, deaf years, when sleep and darkness reigned in the hearts, in the Melchior age every single day is full of sensations, scandals, intrigues, investigations.

And how is this fundamentally different from the current hangout with Sergezverev, Nikasafron, Pugachev-Kirkor? Something is still different, and it is necessary to recognize the following. Many poets and artists were very talented, but most of them truly realized their talent outside the aesthetic and chronological framework of the Silver Age. The latter stretched right up to the 1940s, until the death of the main representatives of the era, but this, in my opinion, is a complete failure of systematization. Or deliberately playing along with the Melchiorites, expanding the scope of their achievements. Pushkin was not in 1835 the "Cricket" of the Arzamas circle. Dostoevsky in 1880 was not a Petrashevsky, and that assembly of talkers of 1848 has no right to ascribe to itself the masterpieces of subsequent eras, for example, The Brothers Karamazov and Russia and Europe (Nikolai Danilevsky also attended Petrashevsky Fridays). The best of the Melchiorites who survived the tragedy of 1917 showed an example of Overcoming. Once upon a time, they seemed to have poked a finger at them: "You will be called the Silver Age, "Solovievites" (the highest epithet for Blok, Vyach. Ivanov), making individually talented collectively mediocre. But outside of this "party", some in Voronezh, some in Prague, some in line at the Lubyanka reception window, they painfully overcame and overcame that silver age epidemic.

Suppose that for this their magazine "Vesy" had to cease to exist, a hundred newspapers had to be closed - albeit together with the State Duma, the party had to be dispersed - albeit together with the Constituent Assembly ... And although the editor-in-chief of "Vesy" Valery Bryusov spoke to the reading public mainly about for yourself, your beloved, otherwise somehow maintaining an average decadent level, a whole era, a country, had to end, so that a new, much more fruitful association "Russian Avant-Garde" "reformatted" the survivors, proving how mediocre their previous "bonding" was.

It is characteristic that the greatest successes of the "Russian avant-garde" were in the 1920s. (And the Diaghilev seasons are still a brilliant tuning of the classical ballet, which even bored Eugene Onegin.)

The "Russian avant-garde" was already promoted mainly by the Futurists, although they were listed in the "catalogue" of the Silver Age in the same row, separated by a comma with the older and younger Symbolists, Acmeists, Imagists, but who grew up on aesthetic hatred for the Symbolists. The futuristic "Point to Public Taste", which came out before the new year, 1913, and the collection "Change of milestones" (1922) closed the "project" of Solovyov and Berdyaev and showed an example of Overcoming.

From the manifesto "Slapping Public Taste". "Who, gullible, will turn the last Love to perfumery

Balmont's fornication? Does it reflect the courageous soul of today? Who, cowardly, is afraid to steal paper

armor from the black tailcoat of the warrior Bryusov? Or are they the dawn of unknown beauties?

Wash your hands that have touched the filthy slime of the books written by those innumerable Leonid Andreevs.

To all these Maxim Gorky, Kuprin, Blok, Sologub, Averchenko, Cherny, Kuzmin, Bunin and so on. - All you need is a cottage on the river. Such an award is given by fate to tailors.

From the height of skyscrapers, we look at their insignificance!"

3. Enlightenment of Sasha Cherny

From the skyscrapers that have grown over these hundred years, we can also "look", cast a farewell glance at at least one of the list of futuristically damned ones.

Sasha Cherny is the main star of the Satyricon magazine and other pre-revolutionary satirical publications. Another pseudonym, in addition to Black, Alexander Mikhailovich Glikberg had a Dreamer. "... A daring political satire... a denunciation of the pettiness, emptiness and monotony of a vain philistine existence... a combination of sarcasm with notes of pessimism ..." - I downloaded this from articles about Sasha Cherny, and I can even reproduce his poems from memory - they were set to music and made up a magnificent disc by Alexander Grabsky "Satire":

In books, the genius of the Solovyovs,

Heine, Goethe and Zola.

And around from the Ivanovs

The earth trembles.

On the canvases - Magdalene,

Host of Madonnas, Venus and Phryn,

And around - crooked backs

Dumb-eyed Akulin.

Cherny's example is good because he has both talent and a sense of duty: in 1914 he went to war. Let not to the front line, like Gumilyov, but as a soldier at the field infirmary, but even this is a real feat against the background

the rest of the decadent "hangout". And the fact that in March 1917 Sasha Cherny was appointed by the Provisional Government as a deputy

Commissar of the Northern Front, this, of course, says more about the government itself. I already described the bohemian spirit that "blew" under everything and all sorts of doors in that era - and the business elite (Savva Morozov), and the Duma, and the government.

Once I tried to imagine, to imagine: what if some bureaucratic, political need arose for the secretary of the Extraordinary Investigation Commission of the Provisional Government to write to the Deputy Commissar of the Northern Front on some occasion? And then the "Official Correspondence" of two high-ranking employees of the Provisional Government, Alexander Blok and Sasha Cherny, would have entered the annals of our history ... Maybe even with postscripts ... and last night I wrote a little thing.

And if the secretary of the Extraordinary Investigation Commission of the Provisional Government, A. Blok, had an official need to clarify the situation on the Southwestern Front (after all, it was the front commanders, together with Guchkov-Rodzianko, who removed Nikolai from the throne), then ... and there he would stumble on a kindred spirit: the assistant to the commissar of the front is the famous literary critic Viktor Shklovsky.

But I digress. And Sasha Cherny in exile is captured by a terrible longing for Russia. The following is a cut from critical articles about him:

"...beginning with the cycle "Russian Pompeii" (1919), which for the first time outlined the motif of nostalgia, clearly resounding in the poet's émigré work... "Who is living well in emigration" (1932), which discovered the only lucky person in a foreign land - a baby in a crib ... "

Do you understand... all the enormity of the difference (as between a living person and a passport "photo")?! That Solovyovs - this was , that "<... in the books of genius once said to him. They poked, outlined with a mentor's fingernail in the book: Chip it! Pass along the chain of talking parrots ...

And the fact that "<... the land shaken by the Ivanovs" was his Promised Land, lost - he himself reached it. Came with life.

4 .. And also in the famous "Tower", a circle of Vyach. Ivanova once...

... But let's not drag out the chain of similar Stories longer and further... Let's stop, because the Connoisseurs of refined philosophy, poetry and such will already be considered as discrediting. They will say that it is necessary to evaluate poets and philosophers "according to their creations", and not, as in school, "by their behavior". But the most significant works of the best creators of the Silver Age were written by them after, albeit forced, like Pushkin's exile,

leaving that "party", or rather, after its "closure in connection with well-known events - the revolution and the Civil War." Mandelstam-, Akhmatova- and Tsvetaevologists will confirm this. It is difficult to say today about the talents of Cherubina, Bryusov, Balmont, three dozen more poets, who, for example, were captured at the lecture by Bely / Bryusov in a round dance around the revolver of the poetess Nina, and about the talents of hundreds of others who did not get to the famous lecture, today it is difficult to say. Then they were looked at like through a telescope, like a children's toy kaleidoscope, and for a real examination of their talents, a microscope, and a powerful one at that, is needed.

Only Blok, Khlebnikov and Gumilyov entirely "fit in", "fit in" (with varying degrees of voluntariness) in that era. Like in a coffin. Maybe silver, but in their case - NOT cupronickel. And Blok also managed to erect a tombstone not made by hands, the poem "The Twelve".

5. Complete aesthetic incompatibility

And of course, the most refined, according to Berdyaev's enthusiastic assessment, in the history of Russian culture, the heroes of the Silver Age could not help but show their aesthetic predilections in connection with an important Russian event - the opening of the monument to Alexander Sh. It was ridiculous to hope that the decadent "party" that escaped to his "holiday of life" from the era when "... sleep and darkness reigned" would be some warm words addressed to someone who personified rigor, ,, expressed discipline, everyday work, boredom ... "Restrained concentration, gathering strength simple everyday internal activity "(Mendeleev).

But here, after all, it also came together: in addition to the strict, boring tsar, his cast-iron image became the hero of newspaper articles, public discussions -

a monument erected on Znamenskaya Square in St. Petersburg by the sculptor Paolo Trubetskoy. Just like Tsar Peter [and the Bronze Horseman] once doubled in the eyes of the reading public...

The adherents of "everything elegant and refined" were shocked: "... Putting his hand on his heavy thigh, bending the huge head of a heavy horse with tightly stretched reins almost to the grandmothers, sat a fat man in clothes similar to the uniform of equestrian policemen ... in such a round lamb hat as they have, with such a short, muzhik-like beard, like many of them, is the "peacemaker tsar" Alexander III.

Double challenge. After all, they erected a monument in 1909, at the very peak of cupronickel sophistication, and, of course, they could have molded Alexander III in any way they liked, to the most fashionable taste of that time. Put the sculptor as a model ... yes, even Vaslav Nijinsky with a glued beard. But the sincere gift of Paolo Trubetskoy, the honest memory of the closest employees of the tsar (Count Witte opened the monument) and the Dowager Empress Maria Feodorovna, made it possible to establish

on Znamenskaya Square, what the then decadents were simply not able to comprehend, calling it a scarecrow, a caricature.

As a result, the contrast of the two eras was captured forever. In all the catastrophes and overthrows of the 20th century, this monument to the "most reactionary tsar" was preserved by an amazing, incredible fate. As well as all the heaps of miserable epigrams, articles, caused by him, have been preserved. Of the most decent - "Cast-iron scarecrow" (D. Poor), "There is a chest of drawers, A hippopotamus is on the chest of drawers, A hippopotamus is on a hippopotamus, A hat is on the headband, A cross is on the hat, Whoever guesses, Togo is under arrest" (Anonymous). From the remark of one of the best artists of the era: "Russia, crushed by the weight of one of the most reactionary tsars, is moving backwards ... A fat-assed martinet!" (Ilya Repin).

It is all the more significant that Ilya Efimovich was the author of one of the best portraits of the sovereign-emperor. More precisely, the painting "Reception of volost foremen by Alexander III in the courtyard of Petrovsky, written, however, in a depicted on it, too, by different, pre-melchior palace in Moscow" era. And the tsar is no means Nizhinsky ... but about the same majestic build, posture as in the monument. And the peasants standing before the tsar froze in a respectful understanding, perhaps even insight: behold, they were honored to see the one on whom the whole country rests. Words like "reactionary" had not yet picked up either they or the author of the picture.

And from what abyss Russia, crushed by Alexander III, backed away, it was necessary to find out in less than eight years ...

White pleated curtains on the windows of the Russian Museum were intended mainly against direct sunlight, glare in the paintings. They never parted, and it is not known what was the reason for the exclusion, but once a Soviet schoolboy, around 1974,

I had a chance to see in the inner courtyard of the museum, which was certainly closed from all visitors, a gigantic, frightening, absolutely unlike any sculpture installed or preserved in the USSR ... Forgetting about all the pictures of that hall, for several minutes I could not take my eyes off the huge, incredible rider and his horse, somehow incomprehensibly resting its front hooves on the very edge of the pedestal. Neither then, having only the Bronze Horseman and Nicholas the First in St. Isaac's Square in my visual baggage, nor now, having multiplied this baggage many times in my journalistic and literary wanderings, did I ever see at least something like that defiant masterpiece. I did not find a place in the world equestrian monumental row where Alexander TP could be attached ...

The attendant returned and lowered the curtain. For seventy years, the monument of this king was hiding in the inner museum courtyard, when much more innocent monuments - much more innocent (innocent before "world progress") persons were powdered. But someone preserved this double, political and aesthetic challenge to the Melchior age, the revolution.

Of course, I do not claim that the then ordinary Soviet schoolboy with a "physical and mathematical bias", having looked at this sculpture, at least comprehended something, enlightened. But I remember a vague suspicion, a premonition that there is something to comprehend here. Some kind of alternative, a variant that opposes the pictures of Russian-Soviet history, which were shown to us on a school-university filmscope. Perhaps, on some occasion, I will have to learn something about this alternative ...

Today, "Alexander Sh" stands near the Marble Palace on the Field of Mars. Arriving in February 2012 to record a series of programs on Radio Russia - St. Petersburg, I stood at its foot, walked around ... I marveled. Of course, I collected a far from complete dossier on this Melchior "pop music" (aka the Silver Age), but I looked through the file of verbiage about the monument carefully. There is definitely no analogy, which, with a fresh look, just asks! The same "Russia, crushed by weight ... backs up", and a mighty rider, strictly vertical - not a degree of inclination, not a shadow of movement ... This is Vasnetsov's "Knight at the Crossroads", where the horse also rested its front hooves in front of us invisible a stone carved with ominous lines of "choice" ("You will go to the right ... To the left ...").

And ... the most unpleasant, oppressive guess: the king's right hand, "stuck ... in a heavy thigh" - a gesture of heavy pause, detachment. It was with such a gesture that the rider, who was thinking hard at the crossroads, let go of the reins, and lets his horse choose the road ... Here is the whole life of Tsar Alexander III, reduced by many labors to 49 and a half years. The murder of a father, a misunderstanding of "society", an invaluable feat of a 13-year reign, heavy premonitions about mediocre heirs ... In general: choose, Russia!

I walked around the monument one more time, clicking my Kodak. The February snow was slipping like a torn cloak from the mighty royal shoulders. I thought, dreamed of such a cover for a new book.

Chapter 10

In the five previous chapters, it was mainly about facts of an intangible nature: moods, opinions, hysteria, decadence and defeatism in a society that had reached the "bottom of the Romanov dynasty". Let's say the captain, the crew, the passengers went crazy, shot each other, jumped overboard - some into the boats, and some into the water ... But what happened to the ship itself? It is not possible to describe in detail the trends that took place in industry, agriculture, the political structure, in the size and well-being of the Russian population, but it is quite realistic to follow the development of the main "question" in Russia in the 20th and early 20th centuries. This, of course, is a "peasant question."

If we go back from 1917 to the very beginning of the revolutionary confrontation, trace the objective contradictions, claims that split the country and society, then we will inevitably return to the "peasant question". Actually, the Narodnaya Volya, who declared war on the Russian government, had no other slogans, goals, except for "the liberation of the peasants with the land." A meticulous researcher may recall that there were also a lot of complaints regarding the regulations of university life and freedom of the press ... but students and writers, the main fillers of the People's Will cells, would be quite sincerely ashamed to reduce the great dispute with tsarism, the historical conflict to their narrow "corporate" interests. Sympathy in society, and their own moral tone, was provided to them precisely by the fact that they acted not for themselves, not for themselves.

Quite peasant, land and the names of their organizations - "Earth and Freedom", "Black Redistribution". The latter, perhaps, sounds like a society of terrorists from another continent - the Black Panthers, and generally carries some ominous associations: black humor, black ingratitude, blacken with anger ... but in reality, in the village, the black redistribution was called spring redistribution of land strips by the peasant community depending on the growth of families and three-field cultivation of the land: arable land, mowing, fallow ... "Black" meant - directly on the land, without legal procedures and papers. Later, the dream of the peasants was called the black redistribution - once, during the spring land survey, to divide the landowner's land.

In the previous part, I, perhaps somewhat ironically, compared the shot of the first attempt on the tsar with a shot from the starting pistol of the era of terror, fixed my attention on the investigative confession of Dmitry Karakozov that he had catarrh of the stomach: very very painful and at that time without a chance of a cure, in general, to die anyway ... Pure truth. But then we must also talk about the very first confession of Karakozov, seconds after the shot in the Summer Garden, when an accidental witness Osip Komissarov managed to hit him on the arm. The rescued emperor approached the captured terrorist and asked: "Are you a Pole?" - "Russian". - "Why did you shoot me?" - the emperor was surprised. - "You deceived the people, promised them land, but did not give it."

It is very difficult, after all that has been said above about the terrorist decadent, Zasluch-Soloviev "tangle" that has rolled to the very "bottom of the dynasty", to admit that ... in the agrarian issue, the Narodnaya Volya were still right. But on the other hand, in the matter of destroying the state, they are, of course, wrong. But on the other hand, the nobles themselves...

Recall at least a thousand historical, political science books, discussions in the press - everything in them comes down to this very thing: on the one hand ... but on the other hand ... Leaving aside this reality, the presence of two sides in any coin, in a three-century discussion question, I will bring only one point - some

indirect evidence that speaks of its then fatal insolubility. And I will add a few unexpected, I believe, analogues of that insolubility in today's political and economic situation.

In the introductory chapters, it was recorded: both the official enslavement of the peasants (the Council Code of 1649 of Alexei Mikhailovich), and the "creeping escalation" of serfdom until the end of the 18th century (my conditional term: "developed serfdom") were directly related precisely to the modernization of the state. Modernization in the main vital areas: military and military-industrial. Most of that path - from the penultimate place to the first, documented (Westphalian Treaty of 1648) - all the estates of Russia went, as they say, "hand in hand." And in general, the entire period of Russian history before "developed serfdom" is illustrated by such expressive examples as the presence in the Sudebniks of 1497 and 1550 of articles devoted to preventing servicemen (landlords) from becoming slaves in order to avoid public service.

This nationwide unity of estates was broken in the 18th century by approximately the following sequence of steps:

1. 1718-1724 - tax reform: the attachment of peasants was projected onto a new, "Peter's Russia", plus an extremely cruel procedure for collecting taxes was established - by billeted military units (similar to the collection of indemnities on enemy lands);
2. 1747 - granting the landowner the right to sell his serfs as recruits to third parties;
3. 1760 - granting the landowner the right to exile peasants to Siberia;
4. 1762 - the adoption of the Manifesto on noble liberty;

5. 1765 - granting the landowner the right to exile peasants to hard labor;
6. 1767 - a ban on peasants to file petitions against their landowners;
7. 1783 - the spread of serfdom to the Left-bank Ukraine;
8. 1785 - "Charter of Letters" of Catherine II: 92 articles confirming and significantly expanding the rights of the nobility granted by the Manifesto of 1762, for example, an important monopoly on distillation.

And then - the classic "developed" serfdom, almost slavery, and the fight against it: Radishchev, the Decembrists, the People's Will ... It is important to note that the pre-serf state was, in today's terms, "equidistant" from both main classes. The highest justice was manifested in a purely "technological" delimitation of their rights and duties: you - servicemen - draft. I remember how at school we were taught that the famous St. George's Day, "the only day when a peasant could leave the landowner," is proof of terrible enslavement, almost slavery. You -

And even today, the fact of such a "total restriction of human movement throughout the year, except for St. George's Day" seems to be a nightmarish violence. Here is an example of a false perception, a mixture of the psychology of the current office inmates and Russian peasants.

Yes, the Sudebnik of Ivan PSh (1497) limited the period for the transition of peasants to St. George's Day (November 26), or rather, a week before and a week after St. George's Day. That is, from November 19 to December 3, there was freedom to change places. It also seems to be small ... BUT ... Imagine real life, the annual cycle, the universe of the then peasant. BEFORE the end of the autumn work, the entire result of his work lies on the field, "on the ground." The peasant was primarily interested in reliable "attachment to the ground" before harvesting! And the same Sudebnik of 1497 strictly forbade landowners to drive peasants off the land before St. George's Day! After him, two weeks were allotted for calculations, when the peasant - the owner (!) of the crop - had to pay off under the contract (!) (the so-called "orderly") with the landowner, so that he could remain in service and come to the winter gathering or to war with weapons, a horse himself, with an armed servant or servants (depending on the size of the estate). And the peasant, having realized his part of the harvest, could walk for two weeks, look for a new place.

In two weeks, you won't get far on the transport of that time. But the farmer himself was also afraid to go far, because all his agricultural knowledge and skills might not be useful in other natural climatic conditions. Fact from my book "Near

Far East. Premonition of Fate": at the end of the 20th century, the peasants, having settled in the Ussuri Territory, were very happy at first: the nightmare of the European part of the country, the drought definitely did not threaten Primorye! But it turned out that with that moisture and that soil ... spiked corn grows too much in the stem and leaves, and the development of the grain is delayed; Fungi that parasitize plants and produce various diseases and especially the fatal "drunk bread" multiply excessively. Only the powerful assistance of the state (transport, agronomists, doctors, teachers) allowed the settlers to survive and, over time, to choose a set of crops suitable for the Far East.

And in the X[V-XV] centuries, even moving 100-200 miles was akin to a spacewalk for a farmer. Large throws were made by Cossacks, fur hunters. The farmer did not need such "freedom of movement", to put it mildly. So do not feel sorry for the "poor Russian peasants" who could not go to Antalya until November 19, or after December 3 - to Hurghada.

However, we must admit: St. George's Day was canceled. Starting with the writings of the historian Tatishchev, it was believed that the right of peasant output was abolished by the decree of Tsar Fyodor Ioannovich of 1592, which has not been preserved, but which, as if, is implied in the decree of November 24, 1597 (on a five-year search for peasants), for which Boris Godunov is very reproached. (By the way, for reference to all those who write about the "continuous growth of slavery, the constant intensification of exploitation": in 1601, Boris Godunov, already the king, allowed the transfer of peasants throughout Russia (except for the Moscow district), but only from small owners to small ones. The last point once again reveals the reason for the previous prohibitions: transitions from small owners to large ones, especially to monasteries, deprived the bulk of the servicemen of economic support, that is, the "noble local cavalry", the then Russian army. Such transitions remained prohibited even after 1601.)

And already after Tsar Boris, after the first impostor, the new Tsar Vasily Shuisky wrote in his decree, blaming his predecessor: "Tsar Theodore, at the slander of Boris Godunov, without ignoring the advice of the oldest boyars, ordered the peasants to leave." But it is possible and even very necessary to treat with caution the words of Tsar Vasily, one of the main, along with Nikolai II, "losers" of Russian history. An example of the cunning common to these two losers: Tsar Vasily, criticizing Boris Godunov for the decree of 1597, forgets to mention the decree of 1601.

And although Nikolai P, although he tried to imitate and stylize as Alexei Mikhailovich (he dressed up with the empress, forced the ministers to flaunt in fur coats of the 17th century, he named his son-heir Alexei), in fact, in his deeds, he was very much like Tsar Vasily Shuisky - he will reach out of necessity and before this speech.

After the historian Tatishchev and Kostomarov, he blamed the abolition of St. George's Day on the decree of Tsar Fyodor (under the actual ruler Godunov).

But Pogodin and Klyuchevsky make a more correct emphasis: St. George's Day was not repealed by law. The severity of socio-economic conditions, the indebtedness of the peasants are to blame. Klyuchevsky wrote: "The peasant right of exit freezes by itself, without any legislative abolition of it ... the peasants, even before the alleged decree of Tsar Theodore Ioannovich, actually did not use the right of exit."

All of the above, I hope, somehow corrects the lamentations about the "eternal Russian slavery", putting forward for consideration the main "slave dependence" - dependence on Nature. St. George's Day and its abolition, serfdom and its abolition, the all-powerful rural community and its abolition - these are all, as it were, replicas of Russia, its phrases in a dreamy, unhurried (in Russian) conversation with the Creator.

To put it pompously, the One Who ordered the orbits of the celestial bodies, Separated the being from the sea, Gave direction to the Gulf Stream... decisively influenced the development of Russian agriculture.

The period suitable for sowing and harvesting at the latitude of Tver and above is four months a year. At the latitude of Moscow - a little more than five months (from mid-April to the end of September). And only to the south, in the Chernozem region, a peasant can work half a year.

In Western Europe, however, the land is suitable for agriculture for nine months, and in most of it cattle can graze all year round, which makes a huge part of the Russian agricultural season unnecessary - hay.

Having 50-100% less time in a year, our peasant is forced to work more urgently, more artfully, which, if we follow it carefully enough, has the most important even political consequences. How this peculiarity, born of the Russian climate, the soil, also affected Russian philosophy, the Russian understanding of freedom, will be considered in Chapter 11 ("The Liberation of the Peasants and ... Russian Freedom from "Freedoms").

A general, integral assessment of Russian conditions for agriculture can be entrusted to one very qualified German, after saying a few words about himself.

August von Gaksthausen - scientist, writer, researcher of Russia. Born in 1792 in Westphalia.

In 1829, his very first work on the agrarian question was highly appreciated by the Prussian crown prince (heir to the throne). Haxthausen was instructed to investigate and describe the agrarian system of all the Prussian provinces. The baron began with the eastern provinces - Brandenburg, East Prussia, Pomerania, and found that in those areas of Germany where the Slavs used to live, "some kind of

mysterious relations that do not follow from the foundations of a purely German folk life. More specifically, Gaksthausen was very struck by the elements of the functioning of the rural community in the Prussian

earth, and this prompted him to explore Russia, "this cradle of the Slavic tribe."

In May 1842, the Russian ambassador in Berlin wrote that Haxthausen's tour of Russia might be of benefit to us. Emperor Nicholas ordered that the German be given an allowance of 1,500 rubles, "... without making, however, a government measure out of this trip."

It is noteworthy that at this very time the previous visitor, the Marquis de Custine, was publishing in Paris the "Bible of Russophobia" - the book "Russia in 1839".

And the Minister of State Property, Count Kiselyov, seconded the official Aderkas to Gaksthausen to assist, but at the same time "... to remove imperceptibly everything that could give rise to this foreigner to incorrect and inappropriate conclusions, which can easily come from ignorance of customs and folk life our fatherland."

Vain precaution! In the sense that if Aderkas was ordered to fight against possible "slander", then it is absolutely in vain, because August Haxthausen returned from his trip completely in love (as far as this epithet can be applied to a pedantic scientist, a German) to a Russian village, a Russian rural community.

The paradox is that even the Slavophiles of the Aksakov and Kireevsky generations sang poetic hymns to the Russian countryside, not knowing it in the way that Haxthausen did. This phenomenon is also noticed in the analyzed work of Konstantin Leontiev, where he quotes Vladimir Solovyov (agreeing with him on this issue): claims". This is the second generation of Slavophiles, Danilevsky, as communists to Marx's "Capital", turn to the book of August Haxthausen "Studies of the internal relations of people's life and especially rural institutions in Russia":

"Every Russian peasant belongs to some kind of community, and as a member of the community has an even plot of land ... there is no proletariat in Russia ... In all the states of Western Europe there are harbingers of a social revolution against wealth and property. Its slogan is the destruction of the inheritance and the proclamation of the rights of everyone to an equal piece of land. In Russia, such a revolution is impossible, since these dreams of European revolutionaries already have their real realization in the Russian people's life ... "

Ah, my dear August(in)! If only it were exactly like this...

Having traveled more than 11,000 miles in 8 months, at the beginning of 1844, Gaxthausen returned to Germany. In 1847 his book was published in German and French. The work seemed very useful to the Russian government, and 6,000 rubles were allocated for publication.

Encyclopedia of Brockhaus, article "Haxthausen":

"He tried to penetrate the inner world of the Russian peasant, and he managed to make a lot of observations and even discoveries, especially in the field of the agrarian system (chapters on ladles, on colonization in Russia). Volume 3 contains a chapter on communal land ownership, which is G.'s main merit. We can say that G. discovered a community in our country: although even in the Catherine era it attracted the attention of the government and literature, the remarks of Boltin (1788) and others were have long been forgotten. G. points to the patriarchal nature of the Russian community, seeing in it the expansion of the family. The commonality of the fields, in his opinion, disappeared in the pre-Moscow era and was reborn again in the 18th century under the influence of the poll tax. G. passionately advocates the preservation of the communal system, as the only means of protecting Russia from the proletariat. He does not deny its unfavorable consequences for the development of agriculture, but advises to eliminate them, without touching the very principle of the community. G.'s starting point in discussing the peasant question was the position that "the abolition or transformation of serfdom in Russia should be considered as a local, and not a national issue." Pointing to the "necessity of large estates for cultural improvements, and, consequently, for the well-being of the people," he argued that in many areas of Russia it was still impossible to manage with free labor. He believed that serfdom in Russia could be abolished only gradually; he demanded only its limitation and the establishment of such legal relations between serfs and landowners, in which the peasants would be tied to the land by their own interests, and serfdom would fall of itself. Even in letters to Mr. Kiselyov, written in 1842, G. opposed the personal landless liberation of the peasants, and pointed to the example of Pomerania, where "the peasants were made into vagabonds." G.'s opinion about the impossibility of introducing an economy in Russia with civilian labor was accepted by Tengoborsky, but was disputed in *Sovremennik* (1858, Nos. 2 and 4) ... Traveling around Russia, he could not help but stop before such an unexpected phenomenon for him, like our split. He was the first of the secular writers to describe the schism and even discovered many sects that struck him with the clarity and sublimity of concepts... His correspondence on this matter with Archpriest Bazarov... is published in Readings in the General. Loves. Spirit. Enlightenment." (1887, book 9)...

The translation of G.'s article on the abolition and redemption of landlord rights in Prussia (*Russk. Vestnik*, 1857) opened a discussion of the peasant question in our literature (italics mine. - I. Sh.). IN

In 1847, G. was a member of the united Prussian Sejm; was at one time a member of the first Prussian Chamber, mind. in 1866..."

A very interesting, worthy figure is this "Prussian-Slavophile", who initiated the discussion of the peasant question in Russia, but closer to our topic, we will dwell on such an "experiment" of his. Gaksthausen chooses two conditional farms each with 1000 hectares of arable land and meadows. One is on the Rhine near Mainz, the other is in the Upper Volga region, near Yaroslavl.

On a German farm of this size, 8 peasants and 6 peasant women must be permanently employed, plus another 1,500 man-days of seasonal wage labor and 4 teams of horses are required. Annually: expenses - 3500 thalers, estimated income - 8500 thalers, profit - 5000 thalers.

In Yaroslavl, only because of the shorter period of field work, 14 peasants and 10 peasant women, 2100 man-days of hired labor and 7 teams will be needed for the same work. Profit - 2600 thalers.

And this is under the assumption that the land in both cases is equally fertile, which, of course, is not the case for the Non-Black Earth region. Fixing half the profitability is, as it were, only the first step, the first iteration in the process of comparing the conditions of Germany and Central Russia. Further accounting for factors will widen the gap even more.

But this very first step, taking into account the dependence on the term of availability of land for agricultural work, in fact - dependence on the Sun, the receipt of solar energy, reminded me of another fact.

Maybe unexpected, but dramatically expanding the horizons of comparisons. Back in 2005-2006, I happened to publish materials about the most, perhaps, "holy business" for Europe - alternative energy; about a powerful triumvirate - Hermann Scheer, Klaus Thyssen and our Zhores Alferov, who advanced solar energy more than others; about Scheer's general idea - the creation of an analogue of the nuclear IAEA - the International Renewable Energy Agency - and that Hermann Scheer did create IBMA (the Latin abbreviation for the International Renewable Energy Agency). Today, IBMA is successfully operating, as are many thousands of solar panels... But this is the number I remember most of all from the time of my work on alternative energy articles. It is verifiable and generally obvious. The same solar power plant in Russia, on average, will produce 2 times less energy than in Germany. This is the most objective final indicator, the specific energy of the sun per square meter, here and there.

Agree, the coincidence of these two calculations (two Germans with an interval of 150 years) is amazing - our specific share of solar energy converted through agriculture and through solar batteries,

50% of the German level. (So 30% of Italian).

But let's get back to Gaksthausen, who wrote: "... If you are given an estate in Northern Russia, provided that you lead in it

economy, just like on a farm in Central Europe, it would be best to refuse a gift, because year after year it will have to be invested in."

And the two most important conclusions of Haxthausen: an estate in Russia can become profitable under two conditions: 1) the use of serf labor; 2) a combination of agriculture with manufactory (occupation for the peasants for most of the year).

The most famous Russian researcher of the problem, the expert on the countryside, the Smolensk landowner Engelhardt, confirmed Haxthausen's conclusions.

Chapter 11

Earlier, I expressed the thesis that the Russian way of farming, born of the Russian climate, the soil, even affected Russian philosophy, politics, the Russian understanding of freedom, and that, having 50-100% less time in a year than the European one, our peasant is forced to work more urgently, more artistically.

I will support this thesis with the words of Klyuchevsky ("Course of Russian History". M., 1937):

"The Great Russian is sure of one thing: that one must cherish a clear summer working day, that nature gives him little convenient time for agricultural work, and that the short Great Russian summer can still be shortened by untimely, unexpected bad weather. This forces the Great Russian peasant to hurry, to work hard in order to do a lot in a short time and to get out of the field just in time, and then to remain idle through the autumn and winter. So the Great Russian got used to the excessive short-term exertion of his forces, got used to work quickly, feverishly and quickly, and then to rest during the forced autumn and winter idleness. Not a single people in Europe is capable of such a strain of work for a short time as a Great Russian can develop; but nowhere in Europe, it seems, will we find such an unaccustomed to even, moderate and measured, constant work, as in the same Great Russia ... "

Further, Klyuchevsky speaks of peasant labor as such, but the structure of my book, with periodic digressions, intertemporal parallels, also suggests here, when our plot approaches the emancipation of the serfs in 1861, to be a little distracted by reflection: "What is freedom?"

Our freedom from "freedoms"

In one of my books, I summarized Western fears and claims against Russia, starting from the 18th century: "Russia ... by itself already exploded with its gigantic size any idea that people used to have about a "European" power, that is, about a member of a European systems of states.

And at the beginning of the twentieth] century, Russia, in general, was not such an exceptional, transcendent world giant. China, India, the United States have grown during this time. And, of course, we ourselves did our best, in Belovezhskaya Pushcha-1991, in the sense of bringing the state closer to the dimensions "conveniently imagined" by Europeans. Big step forward...

What else remains of the claims? It turns out - freedom. It is the concept of the "country of the free world" that has become the most relevant and discussed by politicians. Almost 95% of all claims against Russia are reproaches under the point of "democratic freedoms". What to say about our "freedom"?

Sigismund Herberstein, German XY! century, he noted with us: "People all consider themselves serfs, that is, slaves of their Sovereign."

The Marquis de Custine in 1843 asked: "Should such a people have such a despotic government, or does such a cruel government create such a worthless people?" Today, a century and a half later, the division of Russia and the West also remains according to sets ... but no longer genes, but "values". How do we now build relationships with... or integrate into... in this wonderful, free world? Here, how can I not stray into the primitive and helpless "counter-propaganda" that I have been observing for so many years in all our Pravda ...?

Often a conscientious Western historian, political scientist, reviewing all the details of our state-political machine, compares them with the details of their counterparts and asserts: there is no freedom of choice in Russia!

And without retreating to the days of de Custine, one can admit: yes, neither the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, nor even the current State Duma are equivalent to the parliaments of the West. And in party systems, the CPSU was not an analogue of European political parties. Yes, and the current "United Russia" now looks more like not the British Conservative Party, not the German CDU, but ... we admit, the same dear CPSU!

But this is not the most "terrible confession". The fact is that our people as a whole, objectively speaking, do not value these same free elections so much, in general, with freedom of choice, how Europeans appreciate them!

In the Western view, this is slavery. Or, if without insults: Russians do NOT belong to a free world.

NY. January 12, 2010. PMTEVEAH.VO. Freedom in the World 2010, a report by the international human rights organization Freedom House, has been released, according to which it follows that today: Free states - 89, partially free - 58, not free - 47, among the latter - Russia. Evaluation criteria: changes in school curricula, suppression of media freedom, lack of independence of the judiciary, election violations. Freedom House Research Director Arch Paddington stated that the deterioration of the situation with freedom in the world is due to the fact that a small group of large influential geostrategically self-sufficient countries, such as Russia, China, Venezuela, Iran, acted as an example to follow and defended small states ruled by authoritarian regimes.

That is, 136 states of the world are freer than Russia. According to the criteria of "Freedom House" ... There was such a slogan "For today and your freedom!" , The Poles, laughing at our stuffed (all sorts of ideological rubbish) "raznochinty", incited them to throw bombs at governors and tsars. The narrow-utilitarian application of that slogan by the authors has long been studied, but there is reason to think more widely. Yes, probably, nevertheless, we and they have different Freedoms. - This

"Your" and "our" freedoms are different, and this is connected, in my opinion, with the same initial difference stated at the beginning of the chapter. Our more rushed, more artel workflow has influenced our politics and philosophy.

For a millennium and a half, the Western mechanism being fine-tuned has been working to achieve the most important goal: freedom, freedom of choice - the main values of the European.

The Russian also loves freedom of choice. BUT... there seems to be one difference: our desired freedom, in addition to freedom of choice, also includes freedom from choice! And this is not some kind of paradox invented by me. This is really our, Russian value - to have freedom of choice, including having another freedom - the freedom to choose oneself, or to entrust one's freedom of choice to someone else (tsars, leaders).

After all, Western political freedom requires constant efforts to ensure it, to maintain this very "mechanism for maintaining freedom." The political machine requires constant attention, work, lubrication. Moreover, such work that cannot be entrusted to any hired managers. It really requires the constant work of the whole society, for which work it also requires self-organization (still not easier!) , self-discipline of the whole society. Society's self-withdrawal from current politics in the West is also fraught with the loss of their freedom. This constant political work in the name of freedom is felt by us, in Russia, as a difficult, constant unpleasant duty.

Do you remember from Klyuchevsky: "unaccustomed to even, moderate and measured, constant work"? That is, this emergency and artel style of work gives a projection on political views.

"Avral": 4 months (we take the extreme Russian case) for all agricultural work, hasty procurement of everything that allows us to survive the remaining 8 months. There is no time for experiments, no time for innovations, therefore even the appearance of the saving potato was met with "potato riots".

"Artel": uniting the efforts of all the villagers for the period of "Avral". There is no time for taking into account personal nuances, some special respect for features, individualities.

But in any case, do not consider the enumeration of these objective factors as a draft of some kind of "explanatory note". These natural causes in the course of centuries have given napt, a special type. Russia, and not another, say, Poland or a second Germany. As the apostle said, "God made us different so that we need each other."

And that Goebbels or Pavel Vechorkevich (my longtime absentee Warsaw opponent) became adept at interpreting any feature as ugliness - these are the costs of technology, mainly of the twentieth century ...

But ... are we exceptional in this choice of ours? I've been thinking about this point for quite some time. Our "freedom of choice, with freedom and from choice" - what is it? Found some alternative way of political development, which has its own specific merits, which we need to somehow promote or at least defend?

It seems to be not. In conversations, conflicts in life, in literary works, nowhere did I notice any halo of pride around this "freedom from freedoms". Moreover, this feature has never been formulated by anyone, which is why now it seems to be my kind of paradox. Leaving the feeling of still not an alternative, but rather some

nuance.

One of the formulations of Thomas Aquinas seemed to me to be important, although passing evidence. Yes, yes, the one whose works "became the theoretical basis for the construction of the Western political machine." The author of the books "The Sum of Philosophy", "The Sum of Theology", "The Education of a Prince", probably the most influential philosopher of the Middle Ages, called Chosfog ishkhueza! \$ (dates of life: 1225-1274), canonized.

And so Thomas Aquinas, compiling his list of prayers, suddenly formulated this: "Thanks to the Holy Spirit for getting rid of the need to have a political opinion."

I can't vouch for the accuracy of the quote, maybe the thought of Thomas Aquinas was here connected with some separate, private political debates of that time, but it seemed to me that this particular nuance was amazingly important: getting rid NOT of political opinions (Thomas Aquinas is not an anarchist at all!), BUT deliverance precisely ... from the need to have political opinions!

He may have it, or he may not. And for this additional opportunity, he thanks the Holy Spirit.

And about one more word - the "member" of this formula of Thomas Aquinas, which I really consider among the most important sayings in history: ... getting rid of the need to have a political opinion. Now I highlight the last word of the formula - "opinion". Check out this one too! After all, having an opinion, you can act or not. You can somehow express this opinion, slap a million people on his triumph, or you can ... in general, "leave it to yourself." And Thomas Aquinas, understanding the primacy of opinion, speaks of deliverance - NOT from necessary political actions, but even from the root of all actions - from opinion in general. He seems to respond to those pulling him by the sleeves, calling him (some to the podium of parliament, some to a protest rally): "I have no opinion on these points at all!" His only action is a shrug.

It turns out that our Thomas also appreciates freedom from political necessity, and in a special prayer he thanks for the freedom to entrust his choice to God (or His anointed one!). He preserves it, this freedom, as a shade, a nuance, as a spare valve, as an insurance against the absolutism of the political machine. exit ,

And the Russian attitude to this phenomenon must be seen through a long-standing mistrust: 1) to politics, 2) to machine (routine, mechanical repetition, to "machinery in general"). Maybe someone here will decide that the author, they say, dug up a little-known thought of Thomas Aquinas from somewhere in order to cover up Russian laziness, slavery. But, I repeat: this laziness is a projection, a function of a thousand-year working cycle. And freedom from freedoms is the same value as freedom of assembly, freedom of speech.

Remember, on Rasputin's Matyora, back in the happy, not Farewell days, "a whim, a game in which, however, everyone eagerly joined" was established: the only car on the island ... was not given serious work ... horses were harnessed in the morning .. and the car trudged lonely behind and seemed decrepit and out of place cart. Here, too, the matter is in nuance: the protest is not against the machine (the mothers are not at all the English Luddites who smashed the machines!), but against the absolutization of the machine.

Absolute monarchs, as we saw in the 20th century, turned out to be easily overthrown, but the absolutism of the political machine is a completely different article. You can't even see those sitting behind its tinted windows! Someone has five newspapers and test papers

packages of TV channels, someone has receipts and "receipts of receipt" signed by "people's tribunes" ... and now the electoral mass is stretching, as if from a tube, to vote for the one who has been "posted" on the TV screen for more hours.

The monarch needed only our obedience, and the political machine, as a lubricant, as a necessary element, also needed our stupidity!

Approaching from the other side, Oscar Wilde framed this dilemma in the style of his paradoxes: "Modern democracy has only one dangerous enemy - a good monarch."

And more about freedom as absence. In different European languages there is this semantic connotation. It is said of a debtor who does not repay his debts: he understands financial obligations too freely. The absence of moral restrictions - libertine, free relationships ... Free, no pay - her ...

After all, the popular slogan "Man is what he eats" has already been formulated. And the slogan "A man is what he votes for!" may not have been fixed on pre-election billboards (although, by the way, it was already: "Vote, otherwise you will lose"), but it is implied by the entire political system of the West, which we are taught and according to which we, according to the above assessment of "Freedom

House", - lagging behind, underachieving.

"Freedom FROM choice" is what I called the Thomas Aquinas spare valve; we admit: yes, we also have most of the units, components of our Russian machine are spare (secondary) in comparison with that "spare valve" of Thomas Aquinas. Here is such a nuance. But it is by no means a matter of pride.

Constant attention, monitoring, identifying conflicts, forming political interest groups, checking the reports of politicians, all these things are tiresome for us. Suppose three parties talk about the same fact in completely different ways, and comparing their references, speeches, reading publications with the results of inspections, up to financial ones ... then, before reaching even half of the list of necessary troubles, the Russian will begin to yawn or absently look around .. I remember how at school we memorized:

Only he is worthy of life and freedom, Who
every day goes to fight for them! Johann Wolfgang
Goethe, Faust.

I even remember: we had an approved list of great phrases that were recommended to be taken as epigraphs for compositions.

(Maybe out of fear that some smart guy will shy away something from

Schopenhauer, or even Nietzsche?) And in that list (verified domestic authors, plus Marx and Engels), this Goethe quote towered like a proud rock.

Probably, together with everyone else, I memorized these sonorous lines and took them as an epigraph to some essay like "How I Spent the Summer".

And only now ... so many years, general secretaries, and already presidents later, now I have a good idea of the real, not lofty, our, Russian attitude to that Goethe dilemma:

Is he the only one worthy of freedom? - Who ... well, okay, "to fight" ... But - "every day" ... Everyone ?!

And painfully turning his eyes: "What, and so - every single day" ?!

Nevertheless, it must be said: over all the insinuations ... the bzhezinsinuations of the last decades about "slave Russia", in terms of the fact that "to fight ... for freedom" - Russia is not only a sin to reproach - it is a sin even to compare with you. .. (If, however, this is a real battle, not a NATO bombing of Serbia, but, say, Napoleon or Hitler on the threshold.)

BUT... Oh, this is our magnificent, self-free, but also... non-technological freedom! And regarding everyday life, uniformly accurate maintenance of the political mechanism for ensuring freedom of choice - in this, the Russians will definitely yield to the Europeans.

After such a confession, I see something like the next interrogation.

- After all, it turns out that Russians and Europeans have contradictory understandings of freedom?

- Yes!!! - we will answer.

- Or maybe it's also an antagonistic contradiction? - Hegel and all Hegelians, Young Hegelians, including Karl Marx, all communists, all supporters of dialectics, development and progress will continue to torment us.

... And here, instead of an answer, you can safely send these trying

"dot 1>", into all familiar letters.

After all, today, as we can already see perfectly, historical

contradictions are not resolved, they are not removed in the Hegelian way, but are simply ... obscured by other contradictions.

Just generally forgotten.

The two armies, Soviet and American, stood for half a century, aiming at each other, standing, shifting from one foot to the other, waiting for an order to finally resolve their contradiction, which was perceived as the Main Controversy of the Epoch, as a dialectical source of the development of the whole world. And then some of these crawled out from somewhere on the side ... BinLadens and Basayevs, and that very Main Controversy almost evaporated ... It just somehow became not up to him.

And the contradiction between Catholicism and Orthodoxy? Nine hundred and fifty years, from Anathems and Counter-Anathems, wars, Crusades - to printed and television and radio disputes, disputes. And for all the centuries a strict border between the "canonical territories" was observed and a firm understanding reigned that the profit of one is the decrease of the other, remember the bloody history of Uniatism! worms, all kinds of sects, spreading according to the laws of network marketing. Iyas with great regret and pain read articles about the terrible advancement of sectarianism, for example, in Brazil, a stronghold of Catholicism.

It was as if two professors preparing for a historical dispute, honing counterarguments, imagining the reaction of the audience, rehearsing gestures and finally arriving on the appointed Historical Day, saw a clumsy announcement on the door: "Dispute canceled due to technical reasons. In the audience dressing cockroaches.

- Excuse me, but what about the audience waiting for us? And by the way, where is she?

- Evona, audience! Yes, today at half past seven on the second program the seventeenth series! Begite, dear ones, maybe you will still be in time.

Our contradiction with the West in the understanding of freedom somehow limped on both semantic legs. Remember. The main criteria, and in fact, the bait (!) were announced: economic competition, production level, consumer standards, achievements.

I remember very well how on July 4, 1982, US President Ronald Reagan and 45,000 official guests and half a million tourists watched the landing of the first space shuttle at Edwards Air Force Base. The billionth television audience and the very date of this cosmic victory - everything was adjusted just in time for the main holiday - Independence Day, the birthday of the United States. And barely waiting for this safe landing, President Reagan announced: "We did this because we were ... (there was a gorgeous pause, Hollywood movie cowboys, probably, were also taught the Stanislavsky system) ... because we were ... FREE !" The hint at the USSR was crystal clear

clear. The whole world (except, of course, the USSR) then broadcast this Reagan phrase. And then our perestroika publicists, making their estimates of the level of their audience, remember, often

repeated: "Yes, yes. Take note, citizens. Without freedom, there is no sausage!"

And now a whole host of countries has grown up without "Western freedoms", but with "Western achievements". (Take a closer look at Singapore, the world economic leader, horror stories from the absolutely not free, 100% regulated life of which scare each other "on the Internet".)

Yes, and that tough Reagan "philosophical" binding of freedom to the first successfully landed shuttle ... Well, how to turn it on to another shuttle that exploded in the second minute of the flight? Or to the next shuttle that came crashing down like a fiery comet? "It's because we are WHAT?.." But the embraced gentlemen Reagan and Alzheimer will no longer answer this counter-question. We drove.

And the fact that now the Americans prefer to fly to the International Space Station on Russian Soyuz, is it like "philosophizing"? Again take the foppish Reagan pose and announce: "We are doing this because we are ... FREE!!! Noi are careful too ...".

In one of my books, I spoke about the most important dimension in the era of the Cold War - the consumption race and its very peculiar consequences, which are growing to their full height only now ... Here, without repeating myself, I will allow myself a small ironic digression to the origins of the race, progress in general. After all, freedom, which we have just discussed, is, according to Hegel, progress. More precisely, freedom and progress are linked in one Hegelian formula.

Progress and Prussia

As you know, the idea of continuous world progress was given to us by Hegel: "Progress is the development of an absolute spirit that knows its freedom!" And having ingeniously revealed the laws of dialectics, "transitions of quantity into quality", "denial of negation", having analyzed for the first time all the sources of world development (those very contradictions), our Georg did not stumble even on the most important question, the insidious question that grew as all the laws and development circumstances. On the question "Where?" . If the whole world exists only in development, movement, then it is interesting: in movement - where to?

"Well, this is the simplest thing! Hegel answered. - Historical progress, as I told you, is the development of the absolute spirit, knowing its freedom! And that world absolute spirit stubbornly developed its freedom during all three world historical periods, which I have singled out: Eastern, Antique and German. And reached the highest

goals of their progress, namely: the Kingdom of Prussia.

“ creation of a constitutional

That's right - check it out. Brockhaus: "The "philosophy of history" in the school of Hegel turned into a theory of progress." And Soviet philosophers, and indeed all Marxists, unanimously recognized this (Hegelian progress). They agreed, it turns out, with the fact that after the Antiquity period Hegel had only Germanic - other non-Germanic trifles - beyond progress. And that the pinnacle ^{i.e. Slavs} of world progress, according to Hegel, is the constitutional kingdom of Prussia...

But, you know... I'll give you a comparison. Each time, clicking the button of the electric kettle, we once again recognize - Ohm's law. Whether we remember or not, it doesn't matter. The main thing is that it is impossible, rejecting Ohm's law in principle, to simultaneously wait for the heating of the electric kettle. But it is exactly the same with Progress/Prussia. Using the developed concept of "progress", we must not forget (and not only for reasons of copyright) that (slightly straightening all Hegelian syllogisms here): "Progress" is what leads to Prussia.

The only thing that Georg could not know for an objective reason (his death) was "new adventures of the world absolute spirit". Who, after 1831 (the date of George's death), "progressing" further and further ... hired Otto von Bismarck to guide his development. He annexed two dozen more German kingdoms and principalities and called himself ... the German Reich (Second). Then the Prussian world absolute spirit organized something else there in 1914, then learned to speak more and more abruptly and loudly, raising his right hand up, then ...

Then the most interesting thing happened from the point of view of our book - territorial transformations, namely: Prussia was united with Russia. So now Russia owns at least half (Eastern) of the entire center of the world's absolute spirit, given to us in the sensations of the Kaliningrad region!

I will confirm in the same philosophical style: now the grave of the great Immanuel Kant is no longer a "thing in itself" for us, but a thing ... on the balance sheet of the Government of the Russian Federation! I checked it myself when I visited Kaliningrad in the summer of 2008: condition, care - excellent, zer gut.

It's sad, but as it often happens with us, it is death that allows us to more correctly assess some people, their eras. The death of our sufferer Yegor Gaidar also slightly advanced the process of public self-awareness. And the most valuable recognition came from the "democratic flank". Here it is, almost verbatim:

"Most of all, those ultra-democrats around him that harmed the understanding of Gaidar's work, who for several years kept repeating to society: "You can't 7"

to be a little pregnant!", "Freedom is either there or it is not!", "Democracy is either complete or none!" »

Wretchedness, how wretched are these slogans of theirs! Indeed, the leaders of the "Democratic Choice of Russia" party did much harm to Gaidar's understanding, and indeed to our entire understanding of the essence of the crisis. It may seem ridiculous (after the above Prussian-Hegelian digression), but the Spirit really "develops (progresses), knowing its freedom." And our freedom, which I tried to hint at in this chapter as best I could, it really turns out to be such ... free freedom, that is, we are too free in our interpretations of freedom.

"Too much" - in the Western view, but the cited slogans are a miserable primitive, an all-Russian rumbled stamp, which also does not correspond to our real social model.

These "nuikins" (which is extremely symptomatic for them) confused the freedom with the Schengen visa ...

Here is the Schengen card indeed: "either it is, or it is not." Here you are right, why climb further, to freedoms in which you, like ...

Two examples of unsolvable problems of the 20th and 20th centuries

Returning to the theme of the death of the Romanov dynasty, the Russian Empire, as a consequence of the unresolved peasant question, one can start from those two points of Haxthausen, developing them somewhat. He calculated that Russian agriculture was profitable under two conditions:

1) the use of the labor of serfs;

2) a combination of agriculture with manufactory (occupation for the peasants for most of the year).

Of course, we are more interested in the stability and reproducibility of life in the Russian countryside, but we can also accept profitability as a market reflection of stability, the correctness of the course of affairs.

And again, a sad paradox: the profitability and sustainability of the development of the Russian countryside crippled two of Russia's largest steps towards further modernization - the abolition of serfdom and ... the development of industry.

Of these two global changes, it is easier for me to start with the second - the development of industry. It will be found here and, in my opinion, quite

a convincing analogue literally with today.

So, the development of industry is recognized by historians, politicians, political scientists of all directions as a boon for the country. And, in general, it is. With one important exception, one that remains an open question: how will the village survive in this "beautiful new

world"?! After all, the overwhelming majority of goods, the production of which was mastered by the young Russian industry, used to be produced in the countryside, during those very 6, 7, 8 (depending on geography, climate) months of forced "downtime".

The phrase "the vast majority of goods" should be illustrated. Statistical data on Russian industry are summarized in V. Varzar's table of 1902, of which one can confine oneself to data for 1897, a kind of "total of the century."

Total production in Russia (in thousands of rubles):

Articles made of cotton, wool, silk, linen, hemp, other spinning materials - 946 296

Chemical products - 59 556 Metal
products, including precious. - 310 626

Ceramic, porcelain, faience, glass, cement, brick - 82 519

Wood processing (wood products, dry distillation products, etc.) - 102,897

Only it is necessary to take into account the peculiarity of that statistics: the line "Metal products, including precious ones." included everything made from metals - from steam locomotives to hardware and girl's rings.

As you can see, the textile industry was far superior to all others put together. This, however, is clear even without any statistics, if we recall the profiles of the activities of our main capitalists - the Morozovs, Prokhorovs ... Moreover, it's easy to imagine the "life balance" of a person of that time. In the absence of any household appliances, electronics, after eating, clothes and shoes were the most important item of expenditure. And this gigantic figure - 946,296 thousand rubles, almost a billion a year - is an estimate of the products that were recently produced in the countryside.

My work on a text about the manufacturer Ivan Lyamin, the mayor of Moscow, one of the richest people in Russia in the mid-twentieth century, provided an opportunity to peer into this phenomenon.

The Russian production of cotton, "English" fabrics in the middle of the 20th century was initiated by Georg-Ludwig Knop. In Russia, for many years, this unique German lost one, "obviously superfluous" letter of his surname, but received from the people the proverb "Whatever the church, then the priest, whatever the factory, then the Knop", and from the king - the title. In 1877, the Knops were elevated to the hereditary baronial dignity of the Russian Empire.

Merchants of Lyamina, under his influence, also turned to the leading Russian industry. Ivan Artemyevich after the Imperial

Practical Academy of Commercial Sciences comprehended the "fundamentals of management" in the "Knopov clerks". Extraordinarily intelligent, honest, modest and devout Ivan Lyamin became an indispensable employee of Knop.

Ludwig Knop turned out to be one of three industrialists mentioned in the book "Russia under the Old Regime" by Richard Pipes, an adviser to President Reagan, the main American Sovietologist, "specialist on Russia", not for the first time:

"Until 1839, when the enterprising German Ludwig Knop (Gama Kpoor) settled in Russia, the weaving industry in the Russian countryside was based on manual labor ... it was a kind of handicraft production.

Knop, who represented a large English textile company in Russia, knew how to circumvent the English ban on the export of weaving machines. He gained the confidence of several wealthy peasant industrialists, most of whom had recently emancipated themselves from serfdom, and persuaded them to invest in weaving equipment.

Knop arranged loans for his peasant clients, hired managers and craftsmen, designed factories, obtained raw materials, personally oversaw production. In total, he founded 122 weaving factories and became, by the time of his death in 1894, the richest industrialist in Russia ...

The modern coal and steel industry of Donetsk and Krivoy Rog was founded by the British, it was financed by joint British, French, Belgian capital. The oil fields of the Caucasus were launched by English and Swedish entrepreneurs. The Germans laid the foundation for the Russian electrical and chemical industries. Generally speaking, the weaving factories founded by serf entrepreneurs in the central regions of the country were the only branch of industry really created by the Russian people ... "

Please note: Richard Pipes is dominated by the Western criterion, for him the most important thing is "on whose capital". That's why

the oil industry of Baku is "English and Swedish", and the electrical and chemical industry is "German" ... And in this respect, the textile industry is the most "Russian branch" of Russia, not because the Knops have become completely Russified, but because they themselves Knop was not an investor, he was a brilliant organizer who, in addition, swindled the British with their technological embargo. He "only" combined English technology, Russian capital and the vast Russian market. And it's unlikely that yesterday's serfs, who sometimes hid money in closets, would have risked spending their first investment on some kind of

wells in Baku, the production of electric motors... The fabric was the main, understandable "substance", the sale of which they had a good idea.

"His", the Knopov industry became the most Russian and the largest in terms of production. The yesterday's merchants and serfs, who had got used to it, then took the following steps in the field of industry. The same textile king, Ivan Lyamin, launched the largest production of "peat bricks" in Russia, displacing firewood, saving thousands of hectares of forest from felling. And in general, everything is fine, if ... if only we forget that before Russia (with the exception of the elite who preferred imports) dressed, shod - the village. She could not compete with machine production, and "... a young spinner ... in a low room" remained only in a beautiful song.

And the peasants throughout the life of one generation lost their usual work for those same 6, 7, 8 months a year.

To the overwhelming textile statistics, one can only add figures for the production of the same Lyamin peat briquettes, and then for the extraction of coal and oil. This is wonderful, it saves forests, but only ... the supply of firewood is another peasant winter "business". Vardar's table also reflects part of the "metal products", because hardware is also a winter peasant occupation ... Also taken away by factories, cheap mass production.

As a result, according to the testimonies of travelers, many researchers, the Russian peasant at the turn of the twentieth century was poorer, more gloomy than a hundred years before.

Here is a dialectic for you, a drama that you would only think about, marvel at again and again! After all, the peasants themselves became the main buyers of new machine-made fabrics and other goods (often the best and always much cheaper).

Not a yoke, not a conspiracy, not a war, but, on the contrary, progress, the growth of the common good and such elusive abstractions as "the cost of production", "division of labor", "mechanization", cut the ground from under the feet of the main class of Russia.

And one more heavy quote from the book "Russia under the old regime"

merciless Richard Pipes, I repeat, used by me as an adder, a "common bus", a collector of dozens, if not hundreds of studies:

"The consciousness of the Russian peasant was, to use the terminology of the old generation of anthropologists like Levy-Bruhl (Geuu-Bruh]), "primitive".

The most prominent feature of this type of consciousness is the inability to think abstractly. The peasant thought concretely and in personal terms.

concepts. For example, it cost him great difficulty to understand what "distance" is, if not to express it in versts, the length of which he could imagine. The same applies to time, which he perceived only in relation to some specific activity. To understand concepts like "state", "society", "nation", "economy", "agriculture", they had to be associated with people known to the peasants, or with the functions they performed.

This feature explains the charm of the peasant in his best moments. He approached people without national, religious or any other prejudice. There are countless testimonies of his genuine kindness towards strangers. The peasants generously gave gifts to those going to Siberian exile, and not because of any sympathy for their cause, but because they looked at them as "unfortunate." During World War II, Nazi soldiers who came to Russia as conquerors and sowed death, faced similar displays of compassion in captivity. It was in this non-abstract, instinctive human decency that the radical agitators who tried to rouse the peasants in the "class struggle" encountered such strong resistance. Even during the revolutions of 1905 and 1917, the peasant the riots were aimed at specific objects - revenge on this or that landowner, the seizure of a tasty plot of land, cutting down a forest. They were not aimed at the "system" as a whole, because the peasants did not have the slightest suspicion of its existence.

But this feature of the peasant consciousness also had its bad side. Among the abstractions inaccessible to peasant understanding was law, which they were inclined to confuse with custom or common sense. They didn't understand the law. Russian customary law, which guided the rural communities, considered the confession of the accused the most convincing evidence of his guilt. In the volost courts created in the 1860s, designed to deal with civil cases and managed by the peasants themselves, the only evidence in most cases was the confession of the defendant. It was equally difficult for the peasant to understand what "property" meant, which he confused with use or possession. According to him, a landowner who did not live on his estate had no right to land or its fruits. The peasant could easily borrow a thing that, in his opinion, the rightful owner did not need (for example, firewood from the master's forest), but at the same time showed a very keen sense of ownership, if it was a question of

land, cattle or tools of other peasants, since these things were needed to earn a living. The peasants looked at the legal profession, created by the judicial reform of 1864, simply as a new breed of the same covetous officials: otherwise, why would lawyers take money for rescuing those who got into judicial trouble? The peasant could not stand formalities and official procedures and was unable to understand the abstract principles of law and state administration, as a result of which he was ill-suited for any political system other than an authoritarian ... "

You see, even Reagan's adviser, the unsentimental American political scientist Richard Pipes, fixing the destruction of the Russian peasant world, could not pass by ... in his terms, this is probably "another by-product of the Russian village" , what she brought up, for centuries "reproduced - kind, compassionate, courageous, generous people. And the picture of the death of this world is simply amazing - and not from villains, interventionists (Ay, Napoleon-he! Where are you ?! - Ask the Russian peasants about this - militias, partisans or dressed in soldier's uniforms), but from some elusive abstraction , "the law of value". So you come to the market, take the one that is better and cheaper from two pieces of fabric, and with this 30-kopeck purchase, deal your micro-strike to the vast and beautiful world.

And the previously promised parallel: "unsolvable" situations of the twentieth and twentieth centuries

In the book about the Far East, in the chapter "Chinese", I reproduced my long-standing conversation with Mr. Wen, who held a very important, albeit almost informal position - the head of all huaqiao, ethnic Chinese living and working in Russia and all of Eastern Europe ... In including those who worked at Cherkizon, but, I confess, during our several meetings (2002-2003) I didn't really hear anything about that "market".

Mr. Wen, with particular Eastern irony, mentioned the growing anxiety of WTO officials, US Commerce Ministers about the balance of trade with China, the unlimited growth of Chinese exports.

I, with my penchant for historical associations, answered that this problem is already more than two thousand years old! Even Pliny the Elder and Tacitus were worried, even indignant about "... the irresistible outflow of national wealth to the insatiable East." They were angry, of course, with their ancient Rome, which could not do without Chinese silk and did not find a single product that China needed at least somehow.

In the 19th century, the historian Carl Weile made an interesting calculation of the "balance of trade" in antiquity - 100 million sesterces annually! And he even kindly translated the ancient Roman currency into modern German marks, it turned out 22,000,000. India and China divided this amount approximately equally. That is, for 50 million sesterces annually, the Roman Empire (that is, Europe) bought more from China than it sold. And since the great

invention - the American "boombox" (so, by analogy with a cheap tape recorder "boombox", let's call a paper dollar) did not yet exist, then Carl Weil's conclusion is as follows: "This led to complete state bankruptcy and a lack of noble

metals in the last period of Roman history. All the national wealth of Rome lies in the land of the East.

True, Vejle's contemporary, Queen Victoria, solved this problem (of the balance of trade) in her own way. Indeed, then, in the 20th century, an even more serious product was added to the silk "temptation" - tea. The famous "tea clippers" opened the era of furious racing on the route "Hong Kong - Liverpool".

But what could the British give China in return? England was forced to pay for her ever-increasing purchases of Chinese goods with precious metals. Trying to restore balance, the British authorities sent trade delegations to the Chinese emperors, but the negotiations were never crowned with success. The situation is well summarized by the words of Emperor Qianlong, which he said in 1793 to Lord McCartney, Ambassador George III: "We don't need anyone. Come back to yourself. Take your gifts!"

The overall result of the commodity balances: in China, only Russian furs and Italian glass were in demand.

Where is the connection with the Russian twentieth century, "unsolvable problems"? See:

in 2010, China provided 37% of world production. in 1990 - 14% ...

And even retreat 30-40 years ago? In China - decades of civil war, then the "cultural revolution" ...

I didn't specifically pick up statistics, but I'm sure: at the turn of 1960, China, which was engaged in irrational, obscure things for us like sparrow hunting, iron smelting in home kitchen conditions (which was later thrown away due to poor quality), Red Guard campaigns, campaigns "fire on headquarters" (according to their leaders) - that China had hardly 1-2% of world production. And another big question, how to count that anecdotal "home cast iron"?

And now - a net 37% of world production.

Yeshapsaa!| Trump calls it "...the most important change in the global balance...since the US entered the world stage." To this I will add the fact, if you think about it, almost ominous: "China -

the only power in the world that underestimated the volume of its production.

I will immediately shift my gaze to "our Palestinians", to those same our idle factories, ruined production, boarded up factories, mentioned a million times at protest rallies.

The question is simple: when did they not stand idle, did not fall apart, when were they created at all? That's right, exactly - during the period when China was choking on English opium, then it was torn into dozens of fronts in civil wars, suffered under Japanese rule, hunted sparrows, "Hongweibinil", giving out it is not even known how many percent of world production, but most importantly for export, " to the surrounding world"

went...

What do you remember about "Maae sh Sta" of 1940-1950?! Thermoses? And now?

The collapse of the USSR coincided with the next consolidation, the gathering of forces and the modernization of China (this is in time - "coincided" in some other dimensions, perhaps there are very subtle interdependencies between our collapse and their modernization).

But still ... China snatched its almost 40% of world production NOT from the USSR! (Not only in the USSR.) We simply did not have these forty world percent! The Chinese 40% are closed production facilities, "boarded up factories" all over the world, including in the USA, Europe... This may have been due to a trend noticed back in Ancient Rome and mathematically calculated by Karl Weil in the 10th century.

The "communicating vessels" of the world, the East/West division is so objective, global... epoch-making that you just need to tighten up, readjust your vision a little and look at it as... drift and splitting of continents for geological eras, for the rotation of galaxies. .. For a thousand or more years, China (and India) worked in a way that was noticed in ancient Rome. Then 200 years of crisis, civil wars, unrest, "hunting for sparrows." Now the East again (except for ancient China and India, it is also Japan, Korea, actively growing Malaysia, Vietnam, Indonesia) has more than half of world production - for how many more years, no one knows.

I know ... only that if leaders, politicians poke at our closed factories, forgetting to take into account this global, worldwide factor of a production explosion in the East, then woe to us with such politicians and slogans like: "The ice age has come - the anti-people regime is to blame !", "Gondwana split - government resign!" .

How they will adapt to the new geological period in Europe, what niches they will find for themselves - their business. It will be interesting (and useful) for us to see. But why in Russia

it is necessary to arrange a revolution / civil war because of such planetary shifts ?! - that's what really outrages and infuriates ...

What is the similarity with the twentieth century? Then, in the same way, they poked the government with the ruin of the village, but not one of those poking (and shooting, and gathering opposition parties), not one of these ... individuals did not want to change into peasant homespun canvases and did not figure out how to encourage this in any way significant number of citizens. It is the same today: which of those who poke "stopped production" is ready to abandon the Chinese-Korean-Japanese and

etc. technology? At least... imagine the simplest thing: in your office (of your company, party) replace all photocopiers, computers and computer mail with... (with today's information flows) 350 couriers, secretaries-typists, bookkeepers, cashiers. About Soviet computers, "computers" to me, cybernetics, "introduced automated control systems" in 1981-1990, you can not tell. To load 15 kg of punched cards and see what it is there in one night and count three breakdowns - yes. But in "real time" mode, they just didn't work...

So, according to the calculations of the "Prussian Slavophile", the paladin of the Russian community of Gaksthausen, by the middle of the 20th century, our agriculture was based on: 1) serfdom, 2) side handicraft production of peasants "out of season".

I started with the second of them not only because of the analogies I have considered with the twentieth] century. I was amazed, even outraged - how many historians, publicists allowed themselves to write something about the "peasant question", without taking into account this important circumstance. For those who are interested, I advise: look at least briefly a hundred or two authors, you will also be amazed. Complete mental blindness: once about the peasantry, then (it is necessary to copy from each other) - about agriculture. Completely forgetting about 7-8 non-agricultural months of the Russian peasant. And the logical failures on this second point, distorting the picture, hinder understanding of the first one: serfdom.

Let's return to the thesis "enslavement of the peasants is a consequence of the modernization of (primarily military) Russia."

Indeed, it was so, starting from Alexei Mikhailovich - the first modernizer and the main, correct "modernizer", who, by definition, did not accept Peter's reforms (the official attachment of the peasants was carried out by the Council Code of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich of 1649). So it was before Peter, whose military spending is 80% of the budget and only one (!) Full year of peaceful rule, out of 35. True, he inherited the first war with Turkey from his predecessors.

Having already practically broken the Swedes, in 1718 (only 3 years remain before the end of the Northern War and one victory - at Grencham Field Marshal Golitsyn), Peter thinks about two problems: 1) Where to put the army then? 2) "How can we (me) equip Russia"?

And decides to combine both problems. The tax reform of Peter (1718-1724) consists, as already mentioned, in the collection of taxes and the maintenance of order (the most important matters in a well-organized country), which are assigned to the army. 126 military units are located throughout the country, collecting taxes not only for their maintenance, but, it seems, for all other state needs.

V. O. Klyuchevsky writes: "The regimental teams that led the collection of taxes were more ruinous than the taxes themselves. It gathered in thirds of the year, and each expedition lasted two months: for six months a year, villages and villages lived in panic horror from armed collectors, kept at the expense of the townsfolk, among penalties and executions. I can't vouch that the Tatar Baskaks from the time of Batu behaved worse in conquered Russia ... A huge decrease in the revision souls began to be revealed from increased mortality and escapes: in the Kazan province ... the infantry regiment was missing more than half of the revision payers assigned to its maintenance .. To create a victorious army and finally turn it into 126 unbridled police teams - you don't recognize the Transformer in this.

This picture, drawn, in general, by a great supporter of the Petrine reforms, I would slightly correct. Yes, this mixture of military, fiscal, police work is terrible. But remember, who, in fact, was replaced by the Petrine Tax Reform? Who has been doing all the "field work" for the previous hundreds of years? That's right, warlords. Also, we note, war, the army at the root of the word. Maybe Peter is a tyrant and a militarist who has gone to extremes. Or maybe a pragmatist who changed worthless archers for grenadiers, local horsemen for dragoons, and obsolete governors for colonels. The main question: what measure of compulsion was in his Tax Reform, it seems, cannot be resolved. It remains only to recall that the previous situation, when Russia invited the Swedes to protect itself from the Poles, paying with parts of the state, was perceived by everyone as intolerable, which gave Peter scope for any decisions. Further on this will be more detailed.

This forced (?), temporary (?) measure of Peter was cancelled. Of course, they did not return to the governors, and the functions of state power in the localities were shifted to the landowners. An important clarification: "on the ground" - in the villages. It is at this moment that an important divergence between the Russian city and the countryside in the legal, if not philosophical, sense is outlined. Cities, townspeople remained in state administration, plus sometimes in public administration, but, in general, remained in the sphere of "public law". And the peasants went under the power of private individuals.

The landowner was really interested in saving, increasing the well-being of his "revision souls", and all the subsequent, already enumerated steps to enslavement: the right of the landowner to sell serfs as recruits to third parties (1747); the right to exile peasants to

Siberia (1760), hard labor (1765), the ban on peasant petitions (1767) - can be viewed as a technological expansion of managerial, directorial powers.

Y. Vodarsky in the book "The Population of Russia for 400 Years" records that the number of noble families increased from 15,000 in 1700 to

64,500 already in 1737 - also in their own way "attached" to their estates, in the sense - absolutely responsible to the state for collecting taxes and recruits. And the results of this reform - from the military commands - to the landowners - we must recognize as very positive.

Population growth: 1724 - 13.0 million people; 1744 - 18.2; 1762 - 23.2; 1795 - 37.2; 1811 - 41.7. The state budget from 1701 to 1801 increased 25 times.

It is clear that the increase in the budget is the joint efforts of landlords, merchants, and industrialists. But the increase in population is almost entirely in the countryside, that is, in the department of the landowners.

In general, as Hegel would say (if he, like Immanuel Kant, became a Russian subject for 4 years and looked around the orders of the new fatherland): "Everything that is real (in Russia) is reasonable."

Naturally, this growing stream of common good is mixed with a thin trickle of poison. First, the new rulers abolish the "mayorate", the sound law of Peter, the single inheritance, which ensured the transformation of the European, especially the English nobility, into an active class. The eldest son inherits an indivisible estate, the rest - to serve, to advance science, industry. Peter introduces single inheritance in 1714. The nobility sabotages, and having felt its strength in the beginning of the "age of palace coups", it is also seeking its official abolition in 1736. "Strictness to your children, to children, Mitrofanushkas - let the Germans have breadcrumbs!" - and ahead of us - fragmented estates, up to 2-3 serfs per landowner. The satires on those landowners are well known: Radishchev, Fonvizin, partly Krylov... But here I would suggest a plot on my own, painting a picture of the 18th century in the spirit of the absurdities of the 20th century: "...0.5 or 0.73 serfs per one landowner! - The owner of 3 revision souls could have had 5 children.

The subsequent steps of the nobility, who gained wealth and strength in proportion not only to the overall growth in the wealth and strength of the state (which also took place, see the figures above), but also to the number of successful palace coups, are well known. 1762 - "Manifesto on the freedom of the nobility"; 1785 - "Letter of Complaint".

That's what is worthy of reflection, comparison - it is this "subtly" similar trends. After all, the commissars after 1917 were the same new managers and directors as the landlords were after 1725. And they also showed good results in the first five years.

They proved that the non-owner can also manage well, while remaining strictly a representative of the proletariat.

And slowly, the first step aside: they opened special canteens for the starving commissars. Further: the abolition of the "party maximum" - here today it is just right to ask not only: "When did this happen?", But in general: "What is this?" Then - closed distributors, the 4th Main Directorate of the Ministry of Health of the USSR and its polyclinics, and as a result: the attitude of the people towards directors, party secretaries in 1991 is no better than towards the landlords in 1861.

So what led us off the path of universal justice predicted by August Haxthausen, or at least the "impossibility of revolutions"?

Without aiming at the "meaning of Russian history" in general, and in accordance with the theme of the book, focusing on the period of the Romanov dynasty, we can point out three main factors, the action of which was combined in the first half of the 20th century.

1. The nobility in the age of palace coups upset the basic balance of the state, the service and taxable estates ceased to be "equidistant" from the source of power. The nationwide state became noble for 99 years.

2. The government, having achieved the main goals of the "Romanov modernization", the mentioned throw from the penultimate place in Europe in 1648 to the first in 1814, was unable to formulate new development goals.

3. The "peasant model" of development has also reached an impasse in

circumstances of a population explosion and, as a consequence, an equally explosive, rapid dispossession of land.

Let's continue the statistical ladder of population growth, started a little higher:

1815 - 43.1 million people

1857 - 59.2.

Well, the beginning of the twentieth century - 150 million people.

In this ladder, in my opinion, the most important step is 1795 (37.2 million). That's why I paid some attention

opposition to the foreign policy of Catherine II and Paul [. Viewing the mass of historical literature from textbooks to scientific and

popular books, articles, it seems (the calculations here are very approximate) give more pluses to Pavel.

The general trend is guessed as follows: Catherine's achievements are bright, but superficial, all this - "the thunder of victory is heard, glorious Russia have fun", lists of battles won, Potemkin, Suvorov, Rumyantsev, Orlov-Chesmensky - good for schoolchildren, for "patriotic education". And intellectuals, starting with Chatsky, should laugh at the "forgotten newspapers of the times of the Ochakovskys and the conquest of the Crimea", look for philosophical depths, admire the paradoxes of the deeds of Paul, who is called the "Russian Hamlet". He curbed the landlords, limited the corvée to three days, lived "ahead of time", "lived too fast" ... But he, having heard from someone once that the fate of the landlord peasants was better than the fate of the state, during his reign he distributed up to 600,000 souls of state-owned peasants to landowners. Here is an example of an action based on "half" information, but most likely - "half" for selfish purposes.

Yes, in the first half of the 18th century, they noticed that the Petrine system of government through quartered military teams had become obsolete and the peasants lived better under "their" landowners. But 60 years later, the one who voiced information about the life of the peasants to Pavel, probably received a considerable share of those 600,000 souls distributed. And many of Pavlov's paradoxes, so subtly interpreted today, were simply a multiplication by minus one of all the deeds of a hated mother.

Catherine fought with the Poles, took Kosciuszko (on the battlefield) prisoner. Pavel releases him, and even gives him an estate and, again, Russian serfs to boot. Well, at least Kosciuszko was a sincere revolutionary and refused the serf souls given by Paul. Otherwise, imagine what a national disgrace it would be: among the serfs donated to Kosciuszko, for example, are the parents of the soldiers who defeated and captured him in Poland! However, there were quite a few similar vile paradoxes in Russia at the end of the 18th century - the middle of the 20th century.

And once again I will point out the "invariance" of domestic and foreign policy trends. When inside all politics was reduced to a cover for a colossal deceit, the replacement of a nation-wide state by a noble one, it was then, with fatal inevitability, that foreign policy was reduced to an equally gigantic self-deception (the apotheosis of which is the Holy Alliance, a free European gendarme service).

More details about the wars of Catherine and Paul will be discussed later. It was said earlier about the geopolitical results: (in the Catherine's wars, the most important "natural border" was reached - the Black Sea,

all three branches of the Russian people are reunited). And from the point of view of the topic of this chapter, the abyss between Catherine's wars and impromptu

her son and both grandsons is as follows: until 1795, each war meant the annexation of lands suitable for the settlement of Russian peasants. The whole country, New Russia, Novorossiia has contained millions. After 1795, 1) it was the turn of the lost wars, 2) wars, even won, now brought only enormous problems (Poland, Finland, the Holy Alliance ...).

Here is the paradox! It seems that the same glorious names: Suvorov, Kutuzov, Bagration, Miloradovich, also glorious victories ... But behind these brightly colored plumes, flags, battle crosses on the maps, completely different phenomena are hidden. One of the articles of the informal "social contract" was violated: the authorities, taking part of the nation's forces, ceased to solve national problems.

But maybe after 1795 there were no objective opportunities, new lands?

This is where there is another argument confirming the legitimacy of the allocation at the very beginning of this book of the period "Two Alexandria"! The period of the return of Alexandrov Pi Sh to a meaningful, national domestic and foreign policy.

The Aigun Treaty of 1958 gives Russia the Amur Territory, the Beijing Treaty of 1860 gives Primorsky Territory. And, importantly, China is transferring these almost uninhabited areas to Russia NOT after any war they lost. There was no military conflict at all. NOT by force, but by its ... necessity, Russia received the Amur Region, Primorye. The rulers of China, being slammed by the "NATOs of the 20th century" (England, France, "Opium Wars"), calculated that the appearance of Russia in the Pacific Ocean would balance the situation. (Without the Amur Region-Primorye, Russia's access to the East was incomplete: along the only mountain trail Yakutsk - Okhotsk, only pack caravans passed through the Dzhugdzhur ridge, serious cargoes, guns ... were delivered by round-the-world expeditions.)

The colonization of new lands began immediately, by sea. That is how, through the garland of 12 seas, in the 1880s, the descendants of Nezhinsky (in the Chernihiv region) Cossack colonel Prokop Shumeiko moved to the lands of the newly created Ussuri Cossack army. My ancestors.

And after the launch of the Trans-Siberian Railway, conceived by Alexander III and carried out by Sergei Witte, the resettlement of peasants to the Far East became the largest geopolitical factor. Superfluous (on the lands of the European part of the country) people took and kept the most important frontier of Russia - the Pacific, our "bridge" in the XX] century.

It turns out that there was, there was still a huge wedge of land suitable for development by Russian peasants.

So, at the end of the 18th century, having eliminated external threats, Russia entered a period of rapid, unique in the history of demographic growth. But

if two Russian estates - peasants and Cossacks reproduced themselves extensively, so to speak - "without loss of quality", "projecting" their villages and villages onto new and new lands, supplying recruits of the same quality and the same bread (but in greater quantities), the "expanded reproduction" of teachers, doctors and priests, as well as administrators and officials, seemed to require a completely different proportion of costs and, most importantly, entailed completely new risks. Even if their "professional component" was in time, corresponded to the level of the era, the very appearance of a large population of educated people threatened with previously unknown intellectual epidemics. Seminaries and universities have become breeding grounds for radicals, vulgar materialists, and terrorists. From this point of view, perhaps, one should consider the infamous "Law on Cook's Children": volumes of knowledge without a stable worldview were felt (rightly) as a potential threat. In general, the "head" began to lag behind the body, turning Russia into a kind of brontosaurus, diplodocus.

A descendant of an ancient family, one of the leading historians and publicists of the 20th century, Boris Chicherin judges fellow noblemen so impartially:

"A person who is accustomed to cracking down on his serfs with a stick is difficult to keep from such treatment with free people ... In general, nobles interpret people from the lower classes as animals of a completely different breed than themselves. The arrogance of the nobility has its roots in serfdom. The nobleman knows that he is a nobleman, that is, a person who, by his birth, is destined to live by someone else's work - and therefore he considers personal work a dishonor for himself. (How?) A small landed nobleman can condescend to some commercial enterprise or work that puts him in personal dependence on another, when he himself has two or three souls who are obliged to serve him all his life, and whom he can flog with impunity, how many does he want? It is not surprising that the landowner became generally lazy, careless, wasteful, incapable of any serious business, proud and vain, servile to the higher and rude in relation to the lower. The feeling of moral dignity of a person and a citizen has completely disappeared from us ... "

And it just so happens that this (verbal) criticism was continued, but by deed, by Boris Chicherin's nephew, Georgy Vasilyevich Chicherin, who became a Bolshevik and People's Commissar (foreign affairs).

However, to collect such and much more sharply critical quotations is too easy, there are thousands of them. If you open the book "Voices from Russia" of 1856, published in London, but entirely composed of Russian "cries of the soul", something like: "... a Russian nobleman, like a Russian person in general, can be found at any point

will do nothing for the public good except under compulsion>".

It is more important to admit: the Russian nobles, the government were not somehow particularly stupid, short-sighted. Political decisions on many particular issues were sometimes examples of the art of government. But it was precisely the general non-national vector of state life that attributed everything to nonsense.

In March 1842, Nikolai I speaks to the State
advice:

"There is no doubt that serfdom, in its current position with us, is an evil, tangible and obvious to everyone, but to touch it now would be even more disastrous. The late emperor Alexander, at the beginning of his reign, had the intention of giving freedom to serfs, but then he himself abandoned his idea, as still completely premature and impossible to implement. I will also never decide on this, considering that if the time when it will be possible to start such a measure is generally still very far away, then in the present era any thought of doing so would be nothing more than a criminal encroachment on public peace and the good states. The Pugachev rebellion proved how far the rampage of the mob can go. Later events and attempts of this kind have always been happily stopped until now ... "(The era of Nicholas I. Edited by M. O. Gershenzon. M., 1910).

He organizes the Secret Committee for the preparation of the reform and at the same time, in 1842, he confesses to his family: "I am standing before the most significant act of my reign. Now I will propose to the State Council a plan representing the first step towards the liberation of the peasants "(The dream of youth. Notes of the daughter of Emperor Nicholas I, Grand Duchess Olga Nikolaevna, Queen of Württemberg ". Paris, 1963).

The nobles, remaining (almost) within the limits of loyalty, hinder a great cause. There will always be advisers like the one who, with the help of historical information, advised "a friend of the peasants and an enemy of the nobles, Paul" to distribute 600,000 serfs to the nobles. Finally, 1848 arrived in time, revolutions in Europe, and it is necessary (by all means necessary!) to put on a gendarme uniform and go to save your worst friends, euromonarchs and especially the Austrian Caesar - uff, it seems, it has passed! Minister Count P. D. Kiselev, who made the absolute maximum possible for the peasants - the state, and prepared the "Great Reform" - according to the landlords, testified that after 1848 "the question of the peasants burst."

And how carefully, timidly, these conversations began after the Crimean War - even by the tsar! Here is how Alexander I speaks in

"the noble capital of Russia" Moscow, one might say, before the All-Russian Congress of serf-owners:

"Rumors are circulating that I want to announce the emancipation of a serf

states. It's not fair... You can say that to everyone right and left. I said the same thing to the leaders who were with me in Petersburg. But I won't tell you that I'm totally against it. We live in such an age that in time this must happen. I think that you, too, are of the same opinion as me; therefore, it is much better for this to happen from above than from below."

"Black and white redistribution"

So, the Narodnaya Volya declared war and killed Alexander II because, while freeing the peasants in 1861, he "deceived, did not give them land," as with a still smoking pistol, pioneer Dmitry Karakozov told the tsar. But the majority of the nobles and the bureaucracy that made up the state apparatus, the officer corps, on the contrary, believed that the peasants were given too much land.

'Tragedy. It was Tsar Alexander, according to the testimony of Klyuchevsky (yes, almost all historians), through personal efforts, having no assistants in the government, despite the stubborn resistance of the landlords and local officials, personally traveling around the provinces, softened the bitterness of the landowners: he persuaded, persuaded, shamed. "< Thanks to his personal authority, the most liberal of the options for release possible at that time (with land for ransom) was approved."

From the sea of documents in this direction, we will choose two, chronologically framing the long period when Russia decided on the Great Reform. Beginning and End: from the period immediately after 1815, the end of the Napoleonic Wars, when the whole country realized that the peasant question still needed to be resolved, and until the very winter of 1860/61, the period of the last disputes.

Start

In 1817, in a journal called "The Spirit of Journals," someone who introduced himself in the style of the 18th century as "the Russian nobleman Pravdin" wrote that the peasants themselves were for serfdom, and "<...clear proof of this is the year 1812, when they not only rejected the insidious seductions of the common enemy with calmness when he invaded our Fatherland, but together with their landlords, everyone rushed to protect their homes and dear homeland

.."

In the plays of the 18th century, surnames were distributed in this way, and the Pravdins were usually opposed by Vorovatins, Nozhovs ... But the legion of nobles,

whose position was expressed by the above-cited author, it would be more correct to call the Gluptsovs, or still, rather, the Podletsovs, the Merzavtsevs. From the patriotism of the Russian peasants of 1812 so incredibly vilely interpreted for their vile landowner self-interest! .. One hope is that the "nobleman Pravdin" of 1817 would somehow see

exactly 100 years later, his own great-great-grandson and his last minutes of life surrounded by peasants, commissars ... and would have realized his responsible for this...

It was the choir of such "Russian noblemen Pravdins" that, having merged, influenced Tsar Alexander T, who had been frightened to death since 1801, who gave the peasants in his historical Manifesto on the occasion of the victory over Napoleon only one mocking line: "Peasants, our good people, let them receive a bribe mine from God."

It was mocking, because following the Manifesto, the peasants received military settlements "from God" (from the hands of His anointed one). All royal courtesies, benefits, preferences, and most of the tsarist time, the attention went to the Poles.

But such an announcement of "bribes from God" and then such a real filling of this "bribes" even smacks of blasphemy.

It is clear that such a radical break in the existing way of life, the liberation of the peasants is fraught with upheavals, a weakening of foreign policy security for some time. Kind of like a major operation. But it was precisely the situation after 1812 that was more favorable than ever. Russia provided itself with complete external security for 40-50 years. The moral upsurge in society was enormous. Alexander P decided in 1861 to reform - in immeasurably worse external and internal circumstances!

Sgapa Yapae

And the second evidence is from the "Diary" of Count Peter Valuev, just recently, on January 7, appointed manager of the committee of ministers. Meeting of the State Council on January 28, 1861. At the seventh hour of the meeting, when "... all members who almost spoke the language took part in the debate ... General N. N. Annenkov, with his usual pale verbiage, told a long story about some Saratov landowner from Sevastopol heroes, who was to give his daughter in marriage and who will be ruined by the draft of the Editorial Commissions ... "

'That is, three weeks remain before the announcement of the liberation of the peasants by the tsar's Manifesto, the "Editorial Commissions" represent the result of many years of work and disputes - a draft. A few more days of delay, and the local peasants simply will not have time to start a new agricultural year, to carry out that very "black redistribution" on millions of plots of land ... And General Annenkov tells

a long and completely fair story about a Sevastopol hero, an officer, a landowner, who is infringed by the project. The story is absolutely, screamingly fair, but until such time as one begins to remember that in Sevastopol, in addition to landlord officers, it turns out (!), There were also soldiers who were from the peasantry ...

It is this most important period, the preparation and implementation of the Great Reform, that I skip on principle. Here, to collect historical quotations, describing almost every day of 1856-1861, describing and evaluating every tiny step from any predetermined angle of view, is an even easier, lightweight, meaningless matter.

I will leave only one, not even a meaningful quote, but rather a final cry of amazement. One must first only imagine what legions of officials have been preparing the country for decades for this leap into the unknown. Generations changed, and the sages in the Secret (and not secret) councils wrote "analytical notes", prepared and gave the kings "most submissive reports", beat each other's arguments with wise counter-arguments, and in the end ... As Konstantin Kavelin writes to Dmitry Milyutin (the nephew of the aforementioned Nikolaev Minister Count Kiselyov): "Well, this is Rostovtsev! Yashka Rostovtsev, tongue-tied rogue and scoundrel, political cheater of bad taste - freed the peasants! After all, this would be an absurdity crying to heaven, if it were not true! »

Think here. No, not that the reform was unsuccessful, because the cheat (supposedly!) Rostovtsev took a decisive step in its path. After all, this letter is only a private assessment of one prominent figure of the era in a letter to another. But what is the general tone!

It is only necessary to inform that Konstantin Kavelin is not only a scientist, whose project for the liberation of the peasants went all over the country, "promoting him into the ranks of outstanding Russian publicists" (Brockhaus), but also a practitioner of this area of activity. It was to him that Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna entrusted the liberation and settlement of the peasants in her estate Karlovo, Poltava province. (7000 revision souls). Even more significant is the addressee of this "cry of the soul" - Count Dmitry Milyutin, a key figure of that reign, the Minister of War, who created a new Russian army, the first after centuries of recruitment, on the basis of the "universal military service" he himself carried out. He also closely watched the preparation of the peasant reform, this concerned his ministries in the most intimate way ...

When I was asked exactly how, in my opinion, the Great Reform was carried out, and I saw that the interlocutor was clearly inclined to hear something not very long, boring, that the newspaper/magazine that sent him planned about a paragraph and a half for a possible answer, he always answered: "The reform was carried out in an absolutely Russian way!"

I have already mentioned the finest hour of Russian literature, as Tsar Alexander II admitted and even asked to "tell Mr. Turgenev" that at the moment of the most difficult thoughts about the liberation of the peasants, reading his "Hunting Tales" personally helped him decide ... This, you see, does picture of liberation even more Russian.

So Richard Pipes traces the long prehistory of our Reform, relying on the work of many economists, dismisses narrowly economic arguments and writes about the final determination and decision as follows: "The decision to free the serfs, and come what may, was taken ... by the reigning Alexander II ... It was carried out in spite of the strong resistance of the landowning class and in spite of imposing administrative obstacles. There was a time when scientists believed that this step was taken mainly for economic reasons, namely as a result of the crisis of the serf economy. But this opinion is not based on sufficient grounds.

And among the economists whose assessments Peitzs cites are the famous authority Pyotr Struve, who proved that "on the eve of its abolition, serfdom reached the highest point of economic efficiency," as well as N. L. Rubinshtein with his work "Agriculture in Russia in the second half of the 18th century. » and MisBae! Soyipo. Rotashes ee zeitteig\$ en Vize ver\$ 1a Vn ai XUSH sesse (Pa!1\$, 1963).

Yes, and the whole history of the last 50 years of imperial Russia speaks of the deteriorating economic situation of the bulk of the peasants: payment for liberation. Here, during this period, in general, the Marxists were also right when they spoke of "increasing the exploitation of the peasants" (only for them this strengthening both began from the calling of Rurik and his brothers, and continued until 1917).

Let us now recall that whole immense period of step-by-step enslavement, those paradoxically lived 99 years, when, after the liberation of the nobles, the state, which wanted to remain a (general) national state, was obliged to liberate the peasants too ... Let us recall that even Catherine the Great was the first to start these painful attempts, and here we see how it ends - just with a brilliant passage: "Well, this is Yashka! tongue-tied rogue and scoundrel Yashka - freed the peasants!

Not - good / bad / brilliant / ill-conceived ... namely, in Russian.

Many tried on for a hundred years ... both wise and Great (according to the official title), and decided - Yashka.

Let me remind you the title of one of the previous chapters of this book: "How to bring a problem to the status of "unsolvable"?"

By the middle of the 10th century, the peasant, land problem had indeed reached this status. The only thing that needs to be clarified here is that "insoluble" meant: insoluble in those conditions, while maintaining that country and that structure of society. And if without terminological equivocations: "while saving the life of the nobility - an insoluble problem."

After February 19, 1861, the "insoluble" problem became:

"unresolved". Let's take an offhand assessment of Boris Chicherin: "The transformations of Alexander II were the least that could be given to society, and it quickly assimilated showed that it was ready for this." Chicherin here, of course, spoke in general about the measure of civil liberties granted to society (the intelligentsia). You can extend this formula to the question of interest: "The transformations of Alexander II gave a minimum of land that could be given to (peasant) society." But: even if 6 was given and the maximum, i.e., all the land would be taken from the landowners, the Russian demographic boom in two generations would lead the peasants to the same state of "land shortage". Yes, it is possible without "would". And brought.

And again, an unsolvable (in the then existing conditions) problem, and again the Great Reform, this time - the collectivization of 1929, the main task of which was not so much the seizure of bread from the peasants, but the seizure of the peasants themselves from the village.

In the following chapters, we will look at these "unsolvables", "unresolved", and now, completing the topic of the "Reform of 1861", we should go through the following logical chain: "And yet, despite the insolubility of the land issue, was there a Great Liberation? - Yes. - Then, can you clarify: liberation - from what?"

That is, it is desirable to give a final chord on the view of Russian serfdom, if possible, without polemical overlaps. And here I offer the same Richard Pipes as a guide, I repeat - a conscientious adder of many historiographic concepts:

"What was the position of the Russian serfs? It's one of those things that it's better not to know at all than to know little!"

That's what Pipes deserves a lot of respect for. The phrase of a real scientist who "passed through himself" thousands of books, authors who wrote about serfdom, and discarded hundreds of them, although often the loudest, hyped ones, but "knowing little" ... We read Pipes further:

"First of all, it should be emphasized that the serf was not a slave, and the estate was not a plantation. Russian serfdom began to be mistakenly identified with slavery at least two hundred years ago.

Being engaged in the 1770s. at the University of Leipzig, an impressionable young nobleman from Russia, Alexander Radishchev, read Reynal's "Philosophical and Political History of European Settlements and Commerce in the Indies. The eleventh book of this work contains a description of slavery in the Caribbean, which Radishchev connected with seeing himself in his homeland. The references to serfdom in his Journey from Petersburg to Moscow (1790) represent one of the first attempts to draw an indirect analogy between serfdom and slavery by emphasizing those features (for example,

lack of marital rights), which in fact were characteristic of both of them. The anti-serfdom literature of the following decades, written by authors nurtured in the Western spirit, made this analogy a commonplace, and from then it was assimilated by Russian and Western thought (emphasis mine. - I. Sh.). But even in the heyday of serfdom, shrewd authors often rejected this superficial analogy. After reading Radishchev's book, Pushkin wrote a parody called "Journey from Moscow to St. Petersburg" ... "

Pipes then cites an excerpt from this parody. And continues:

"The Russian serf lived in his own hut, and not in slave barracks. He worked in the fields under the supervision of his father or older brother, and not under the supervision of a hired overseer. Although, legally speaking, the serf did not have the right to own property, in fact he possessed it throughout the entire period of serfdom - a rare example of when the disrespect for the law prevailing in Russia benefited the poor.

The landowner had power over the serfs primarily by virtue of the fact that he was responsible to the state as a tax agent and recruiter. In this capacity, he disposed of great and uncontrolled power over the serf, which in the reign of Catherine II really came close to the power of the slave owner. Nevertheless, he was never the legal owner of a serf, but only owned the land to which the peasant was attached. The trade in serfs was strictly prohibited by law. Some feudal lords were still engaged in such bargaining, bypassing the law, however, in general, the peasant could be sure that if he so desired, he would live with his family in his own hut until the end of his days ... the serf accepted his fortune with the same fatalism with which he bore the other hardships of peasant life. From the earliest period of colonization, the peasant carried away the conviction that the virgin lands belonged to no one and that the arable land belonged to the one who cleared and cultivated it. This conviction was further strengthened after 1762, when the nobles were released from compulsory public service. The peasants, by some instinct, felt the connection between the obligatory service of the nobility and their own serfdom. Since that year, the peasants lived in anticipation of the great "black redistribution" ... "

Pipes carefully collects all the objective assessments of contemporaries, for example, Robert Bremner (VoBeg Vgetpeg), a comparison of which with the very "Bible of Russophobia" "Russia in 1839" by the Marquis de Custine creates the impression that they traveled not only to different countries, but to different planets. Robert Bremner writes:

"Without any hesitation, I say that the condition of the peasantry here is much better than the condition of this class in Ireland. In Russia there is an abundance of products, they are good and cheap, but in Ireland they are scarce, they are bad and expensive. Here in every village you can find good, comfortable log houses, huge herds are scattered over the vast pastures, and a whole forest of firewood can be purchased for

pennies. The Russian peasant can get rich by ordinary diligence and frugality, especially in villages located between capitals ...

And in those parts of Great Britain which are supposed to have been freed from Irish poverty, we have witnessed a wretchedness in comparison with which the conditions of the Russian peasant are a luxury. There are areas of Scotland where people huddle in houses that the Russian peasant considers unsuitable for his cattle ... "

But the same Robert Bremner, after these laudatory assessments, continues: "... However, the distance between them is huge, immeasurable, can be expressed in two words: the English peasant has rights, but the Russian has none!"

And Pigs again:

"There were far fewer peasant unrest in tsarist Russia than is commonly thought. Compared to most countries, the Russian countryside of the imperial era was an oasis of law and order... In fact, most of the so-called peasant "unrest" was not violent and was simply defiance. They performed the same function as strikes in modern democratic societies (emphasis mine. - I. Sh.)".

Further, Pipes makes a brilliant analysis of how these "strikes" by our propagandists, statistical conjurers and ... interested "siloviki" turned into "unrest", and then into "peasant riots".

"It is especially important to get rid of the misconceptions associated with the so-called cruelty of the landowners towards the serfs...

indulging his sadistic urges, he projects them onto the past; but his desire to torture others has nothing to do with what actually happened when such things were possible. Serfdom was an economic institution, and not some kind of closed world created to satisfy sexual appetites ... One odious example of Saltychikha, a sadistic landowner immortalized by historians, who in her free time tortured serfs and tortured dozens of courtyards to death, cannot be dispensed with. She tells us about as much about Tsarist Russia as Jack the Ripper does about Victorian London. Where some statistics are available, they indicate moderation in the application of disciplinary measures. So, for example, the landowner had the right to hand over disobedient peasants to the authorities to be sent to Siberian exile. Between 1822 and 1833 1283 peasants were subjected to such punishment. On average, 107 people a year for more than 20 million landlord peasants is not such a stunning figure ... "

This brilliant irony of a Harvard professor is directed at the clichés of Russophobic propaganda. Here we have a good reason to think: where was the maximum concentration of these clichés, carefully refuted by the Harvard scholar?! Hunger, Cold, Blood, Tsarism ... Consumption and Siberia - the last two words may already remind you of the author through poetic meter. Yes, yes ... Nekrasov, Dobrolyubov and others ... Our "populists", "calling to the ax." And it would be nice to somehow take and compare the specific concentrations of such "facts" on the pages of Lenin's Iskra and Goebels' Völkische Beobachter ...

Pigs:

"Russian customary law, which guided the rural communities, considered the confession of the accused to be the most convincing evidence of his guilt. Created in the 1860s volost courts, designed to deal with civil cases and managed by the peasants themselves, the only evidence in most cases was the confession of the defendant (emphasis mine. - I. Sh. - This example will also help at the "trials of the 1930s" - look without the help of devilry, mysticism or conspiracy eyepieces) ... The peasant believed that the tsar knew him personally, and if he knocked on the door of the Winter Palace, he would be warmly received and not only listened to, but also delved into his complaints to the smallest detail. It was precisely because of this patriarchal worldview that the peasant showed such familiarity towards his sovereign that there was absolutely no place in Western Europe. During his trips around Russia with Catherine the Great, Count de Segur (Chezedlag) noted with surprise how at ease ordinary villagers talked with their empress ... "

I will add to what Pipes said and the well-known fact that only the peasants said "you" to the king. One cannot even imagine - the ear hurts - a peasant turning to the monarch: "You, the king ...".

I hope, having re-read, with my minimal comments, "Russophobe" Pipes, you have not only taken a break from real modern slander, bzhezinsinuations, but also found out something in passing. For example, who was the first to launch the equation "serfdom = slavery" into the public. And a thorough Pipes investigation: "Anti-serfdom literature, written by authors brought up in the Western spirit, made this analogy a commonplace, and from them it was assimilated by Russian and Western thought," will help to understand today's events that are coming to us.

And the last manipulations with the Russian village

So, here I supplemented the liberation of the peasants of the 19th century from serfdom, I hope, at least partially ... by "liberating the reader of the 20th] century" from some clichés associated with serfdom.

The main thing worth repeating is that the "Great Peasant Reform of 1861" with any variant of redistribution of land: "black redistribution", which gave the name of the People's Will organization, "black and white ...", whatever - did not solve the problem of peasant land shortages.

Data from the Russian Ministry of Agriculture. Average collection from 1 tithe in quarters:

1870 4.4 4.4 4.1 1871
kA 3.6 27 1872 3.8
2.9 her 1873 4.3 3.0
ZA 1874 4.9 4.8 cr
1875 ie 2.8 25 1876
37 2, 9 3.5 1877
3.6 4.4 ST 1878 4.9
W7 33 1883 3.8 4.4
ST 1884 4.8 5.4
32 1885 4.9 4.3
before 1886 4.6 3:2
ST 1887 5.2 6.2 4

1888 5 kt 1889
3.9 3.8 3.3 1890 3.9
4.2 1 1891 23 2.1
2.6 1892 3.5 4.9 2
B 1893 o 5 21 1894
5.3 h 3.9 1895
- B 4.1

Let's compare with the current units. 1 hectare \u003d 0.9 tithes, 1 quarter \u003d 209.9 liters (i.e., about a barrel. By a slightly strange coincidence, although a quarter is a measure of volume, not weight, it is in the case of the specific gravity of grain that our old quarter / tithe is very close to the new, metric centner/hectare). But for the sake of this chapter, it is enough to simply note that there has been almost no increase in yields over 25 years. Further, a comparison with the yield in Western Europe (in the same quarters from the tithe):

Wheat Rye
Russia 4.5 4.3
France 114 10.1
Prussia 114 thou
Austria 9.5 9.7 Great
Britain 33.5 ---

According to the data of Zbayiaie adt! coe ae la Ehapse, the average yield of the main grains was per hectare for 9 [Germany, France, Austria, Great Britain, Belgium, Sweden, United States,

Canada, Australia] of the states of Western Europe and America, in comparison with Russia, is as follows:

Average Yields Ros

birth rate Average these 3 foreign-
yield composition. % of Russia foreign state
states. HectoIntroEee

Wheat 16.69 8.10

Rye 15.96 8.92

Barley 2138

Oats 27.60 13.90

Potatoes 9.27 6.40

An article in Brockhaus, based on the work of Dokuchaev and Fortunatov, explains: "Such a huge difference in average yield depends, of course, not so much on more favorable climate conditions, etc., but on the general level of technology and the economic situation of the economy."

The fixation of this very fact is a good starting point for considering the next grand delusion of that era (sinking to the "bottom of the dynasty").

Pavel Milyukov, the most authoritative (whatever one may say, and sadly, it is!) scientist and politician of the period of the turn of the century, the future head of the Cadets party, a member of the Provisional Government, wrote in his "Essays on the History of Russian Culture":

"The degree of economic development of the country depends on the number of population in the country. The more densely a certain area is populated, the more labor the population can show, the better it can distribute this labor among themselves, the more it can accumulate savings ... By the time of the death of Peter the Great (1725), there were only about 13 million inhabitants in Russia. Now there are 150 million in it ... Under Peter, in European Russia lived, on average, only 3.7 people per square meter. kilometer ... about as much as now lives in the Arkhangelsk or Vologda provinces. In the same space of Petrine Russia in our time is placed ... 59 million. This will give 177 people per kilometer. Meanwhile, 73.1 people per square meter live in Austria-Hungary. km, in France - 73.8, in Germany - 112, in Italy - 117.6, in England - 140, in Belgium - 243 ... In all of Europe, only the Balkan Peninsula and Spain can to some extent be compared with Russia in terms of weak population.

... This fact alone will show us how far Russia must have lagged behind the Western states in terms of its economic development ... Prussia already two hundred years ago reached the density that old Russia now has, and more than a hundred years ago it surpassed it. .. France already at the beginning of the XIX century, that is, half a thousand years ago, had 40 people / sq. km ... how much only well-populated areas of Russia now have. As for England, it reached the average density of present-day Russia back in the time of William the Conqueror (mid-10th century).

At that time, about 21 people per square meter lived in it. km ... True, in none of the named countries there is such a huge mass of inconvenient and desert lands as in Russia (my italics. - I. Sh.) ... There is, obviously, for each country and for each time some then the natural limit of saturation of the country with the population ... Judging by the low degree of population, by the large number of marriages and births ... the Russian population is in a period of free growth ... "

You see how, starting from the generally banal fact - "population growth has a positive effect on economic development", Milyukov quickly leads the reader into complete jungle, prophesying the then Russia "free increase in population density" to the degrees of French, German ...

True, he has a confession that ... "in none of the named countries there is such a huge mass of inconvenient and deserted lands as in Russia." And here Milyukov is right and wrong. Right, having made this note, and fundamentally wrong, without specifying, but what exactly is the specific part of this inconvenience. But the difference is phenomenal! I don't have statistics from the end of the 20th century at hand, but based on what kind of texture it is, what is behind this indicator (the share of swamps, forests, tundra, mountains), it is clear that these conditions could not change somehow in a hundred years .

I will refer to the work of G. V. Dobrovolsky "Soil Resources of Russia for 150 Years" from the analytical yearbook "Russia in the Environment: 2002" (Ed. N. N. Marfenin. Under the general editorship: V. I. Danilova -Danilyana, S. A. Stepanova).

"...More than half of the area of Russia is occupied by various northern soils and about a third by soils of mountain landscapes, mostly also cold ones. Half of Russia's area is covered with permafrost.

Only a quarter of the country's land fund is favorable for agriculture to varying degrees, since in the northern and middle forest zones there is a lack of solar heat ... Only 13% of the territory of Russia is occupied by agricultural land, and even less arable land - only 7% ... For comparison in the USA they account for 68%, in England - 80%, in France - 66% ... "

That is a sixfold gap with England! Milyukov's inattention to texture reminded me here of "the main Russian philosopher of the era"

VI. Solovyov, namely, his accusation of Europe, which we have considered, "which has not been able to solve the Jewish question for 2000 years", and his indiscriminate inclusion of Russia in the number of accused (which somehow solved this issue for 100 years). With further accusations, he brought Russia to the "worst students" in the "subject" "Jewish furnishing", and completely forgot about the initial twenty-fold (!) difference in terms ... "The Silver Age is on the march." Tsekadans - in politics, economics, even in statistics, even in arithmetic.

Another factor forgotten by the decadent Kadet historian and politician is the relative share of the rural population in Europe and Russia. Fixing the backlog of Russia from Europe in terms of population density per sq. km and interpreting this as a big stepping stone for the "free growth of the density of the Russian population", he does not attach due importance to the fact that European population density targets have been achieved at the expense of cities. And in Russia in 1914, the rural population is 115.9 million people, and the urban population is 18.5 million.

S. G. Kara-Murza in his work "Soviet Civilization" speaks of a "sector gap":

"In the West, industry developed in such a way that the city drew labor from the countryside and the rural population was reduced. The village did not get poorer, but richer. In 1897, with a population of 128 million people in Russia, only 12.8% lived in cities. In Germany in 1895 the rural population was 35.7%, and in 1907 28.7%. And most importantly, its absolute number also decreased due to its outflow to industry. In England and France, the absolute decline in the rural population began even earlier (in 1851 and 1876). In Russia, the absolute number of the rural population was growing rapidly. Thus, in the countries of Western Europe there were no long periods of agrarian overpopulation at all, while the decline in the rural population was accompanied by an increase in production per employee due to the transition to an intensive grass-field system ... "

In one paragraph, I will not refute the author's words, but clarify. Saying: "In the countries of Western Europe there were no long periods of agrarian overpopulation at all," Kara-Murza seems to be referring to the situation since the 10th century, which was improved thanks to a well-thought-out policy. BEFORE that, this "agrarian overpopulation" just happened, it is called one of the main causes of the Great French Revolution. In England, the problem of agrarian overpopulation was solved (just as tragically and bloodily) even earlier, in XY! century, during the famous "fencing period".

But then the state machine began to work more intelligently, and the influx of the rural population began to be absorbed by the cities.

Were calculated a long time ago - I will call it something like this here: "equations of sustainable, reproducible grassland farming" (combinations of arable land with grazing and fallow) in the absence of mineral

fertilizers. This requires about 10 tons of manure per 1 ha of arable land per year -

i.e. 6 heads of cattle. In Russia at the turn of the century, there were 1.2 heads of cattle per tithe (about a hectare). In turn, to feed this one head, you need to have 1 tithe of the meadow. And in Russia at that time 2-3 heads were fed on a tithe. This did not allow to increase productivity, but forced to plow pastures even more. Vicious circle.

In 1870-1900, in the European part of Russia, the area of arable land increased by 40.5%, the rural population - by 56.9%, and the number of livestock - by only 9.5%. Even Emperor Pavel, contemplating a grandiose reform, planned to reach the figure of 15 acres of land per yard - this figure was quite soundly calculated, this is the milestone figure in Russia, a condition for sustainable life. But by 1877, 28.6% of peasant households already had less than 8 acres / yard. In 1905, such already -

50 %. The number of horses per peasant household: in 1882 - 1.75, in 1900-1905 - 1.5. It is clear that this is due to the catastrophic reduction in the area of pastures. And the reduction in draft power is also a blow to the possible introduction of horse harvesters, winnowers, threshers and

etc., all of the then pre-tractor mechanization. And this is another important factor in the decline in labor productivity in agriculture, which, alas, is almost ignored. Another vicious circle that has swept over Russia.

Here we must self-critically recall one very caustic our anecdote about the Chinese during the "cultural revolution". That they have the fastest agricultural production: in the morning they planted potatoes, and in the evening they dig them out - "because you want to estimate the cut."

So the situation of many of our peasants at the turn of the 10th-20th centuries had, if you think about it, an almost absurd feature: the use of agricultural machinery was steadily reversing, and, in the limit, could approach the situation of 6000 years ago, BEFORE the domestication of the horse! There is nowhere to graze, everything has been plowed up: you also "want to eat".

What is this - "rural overpopulation"?

This question, as the original, fundamental "Law of Value", does not cause controversy, and modern economists use the definition adopted in Marxist textbooks:

"Hidden overpopulation, agrarian, is one of the forms of relative overpopulation under capitalism (see Industrial Reserve Army of Labor). The penetration of capital into agriculture leads to the fact that in this sector of the economy the labor force becomes relatively "superfluous". "A part of the rural population is therefore constantly in such a state when it is about to pass into the ranks of the urban or manufacturing proletariat, and is waiting for conditions favorable for this transformation" (Marx K., see Marx K., Engels F. Soch., 2 ed.,

vol. 23, p. 657). The growth of the organic composition of capital is accompanied by an absolute and relative decrease in demand for agricultural products. workers, the degree of "pushing out" from the page - x. the production of manual labor is increasing. In the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, with the transition of agriculture to the machine stage of production, not only wage workers, but also small commodity producers and landowners are forced to move from agriculture to the ranks of the urban proletariat, turning in fact into hired workers with an allotment. In the developed countries of capitalism, the industrialization of agriculture

economy is accompanied by a massive ruin of medium-sized peasant and farm enterprises. The hidden character of the agrarian overpopulation lies in the fact that the ruined peasants, small and medium farmers, while remaining formally independent owners, are forced to replenish the army of hired labor in the city, thereby expanding the army. sphere of capitalist exploitation. S. p is especially great.

in developing countries.

Lit. : see at Art. The universal law of capitalist accumulation.

To my students who demand clarification, I explain it something like this. Take, for example, a factory: 500 workers and employees. Without expanding it, without modernizing it, without adding machine tools, you can somehow find employment on it (for example, by order of the authorities who were fighting unemployment) another 50 people. Well, it is possible to accept another 20, 30 relatives, nephews, and friends into the plant management. But a factory created for 500 people (without expanding it) cannot accommodate 2,000 people.

And in the village, on the land that was cultivated by 500 people, it turned out over time to work and 2000 and even 5000 people. These were roughly the proportions of population growth in rural Russia since the beginning of the 18th century.

And after all, the main thing is that one cannot even mentally, silently condemn this "irresponsible growth of the rural population." This is similar to the natural growth of the body. It is the Head that has to think about how to get new, larger clothes for its growing Body!

Suppose the reader does not like this image - okay, books, even textbooks, are full of comparisons of that situation with an "explosion of steam in a boiler." Applying to that more popular image, I will still repeat: the Head, the City, the Government, the Capital are simply obliged to connect a cylinder with a piston to this "boiler" and put steam to work, and not to explode. Without this skill, the City, Government, Capital, Elite are not the Head, but also the Body - moreover, a very dishonorable, unprintable part of the Body ... although wearing glasses and sometimes a hat.

This is what is criminal about the policy of the first half of the twentieth century, and above all Alexander G, who had much better conditions for the reform than his heirs, and did nothing (except, again, "military

settlements", criminal already in the highest degree).

And when, in his doctoral dissertation "The Boyar Duma of Ancient Rus", V. O. Klyuchevsky casually says, maybe even ... ironically about "... the unique ability of the Russian farmer to deplete the soil", here he is also part of that Head, so badly taking care of your body.

Liberation of the peasants and "liberation from the peasants"

Many authors can read that, having abolished serfdom in 1861, the government shifted the functions of the landlords (primarily collecting taxes and maintaining order) to the rural community, which just "locked the steam in the boiler", preventing the ever-growing population from leaving the overcrowded villages. That's the drama, that the liberation of the peasants turned out to be a much longer process than anyone involved, supporters or opponents of the abolition of serfdom could have imagined. Replacing the landowner's control with communal control is one of the inevitable stages. There was no one / nothing to replace them, the landowners, in the middle of the twentieth century.

Gaksthausen is right in describing the virtues of the Russian rural community. It was her flexible strength that made it possible: a) to replace the landowner who had already left and the state that had not yet arrived,

6) to somehow maintain social peace in the face of an avalanche of overpopulation and lack of land.

Only after 45 years in Russia did they begin the next stage, when the developed technically equipped (communications and transport) state apparatus was able to reach / reach even an individual peasant.

Only 56 years were allotted to Russia, counting from reform to revolution. It is negligible, if we remember that during this time the country had to form twice not something, but a way of life, a sustainable way of life, based not only on laws (0 weakness of our legal system has already been mentioned), but also on tradition, habit.

The first step is the establishment of life without the (power) of the landowner, the second - without the (power) of the community. Once again, it must be emphasized: Stolypin did not destroy, did not prohibit by the famous Law of November 9, 1906 - God forbid! - the community, but only simplified the way out of it. The peasant world had to have time to learn, to get used to living next to ... the kulak - such was the rude nickname, rich in heavy associations, for strong peasants who risk being the first to leave the community, take their allotment, start buying up strangers, hire laborers, "peace", etc. d.

About a third to a half of historians call the "destruction of the community" Stolypin's mistake, one of the causes of the revolution. Silent or not thinking that the only saving alternative could